102 MONITOR

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

VOLUME 9
No. 3
MARCH, 1979

THE WHITE HOUSE, PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER - EXECUTIVE ORDER 12114 of JANUARY 4, 1979, ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS ABROAD OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS, FEDERAL REGISTER, JANUARY 9, 1979.

****

EPA ADMINISTRATOR DOUGLAS M. COSTLE SPOKE BEFORE THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE, SPENDING SOME POPULARITY: THE POLITICS OF HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C. on FEBRUARY 27, 1979.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, MEMORANDUM FOR NEPA LIAISONS: AGENCY IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURES UNDER CEQ's NEPA REGULATIONS, JANUARY 19, 1979.

Questions or comments on this publication should be addressed to:

Editor
102 Monitor
Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities (A-104)
401 M Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 755-0780

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Executive Order 12114, President Jimmy Carter, Reprint of January 9, 1979, Federal Register	1
2.	Speech by Douglas M. Costle	5
3.	Memorandum For NEPA Liaisons, Council on Environmental Quality	14
4.	State Index of EIS's Filed During February, 1979	25
5.	Agency Index of EIS's Filed During February, 1979	30
6.	102 Monthly Statement Summary for February, 1979	34
7.	Environmental Impact Statements Filed February, 1979	35
8.	Cumulative Summary for 1979	75
9.	Subscription Information	76

[3195-01-M]

Title 3

The President

Executive Order 12114 of January 4, 1979

Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and as President of the United States, in order to further environmental objectives consistent with the foreign policy and national security policy of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1.

1-1. *Purpose and Scope.* The purpose of this Executive Order is to enable responsible officials of Federal agencies having ultimate responsibility for authorizing and approving actions encompassed by this Order to be informed of pertinent environmental considerations and to take such considerations into account, with other pertinent considerations of national policy, in making decisions regarding such actions. While based on independent authority, this Order furthers the purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act and the Deepwater Port Act consistent with the foreign policy and national security policy of the United States, and represents the United States government's exclusive and complete determination of the procedural and other actions to be taken by Federal agencies to further the purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act, with respect to the environment outside the United States, its territories and possessions.

Sec. 2.

2-1. *Agency Procedures.* Every Federal agency taking major Federal actions encompassed hereby and not exempted herefrom having significant effects on the environment outside the geographical borders of the United States and its territories and possessions shall within eight months after the effective date of this Order have in effect procedures to implement this Order. Agencies shall consult with the Department of State and the Council on Environmental Quality concerning such procedures prior to placing them in effect.

2-2. *Information Exchange.* To assist in effectuating the foregoing purpose, the Department of State and the Council on Environmental Quality in collaboration with other interested Federal agencies and other nations shall conduct a program for exchange on a continuing basis of information concerning the environment. The objectives of this program shall be to provide information for use by decisionmakers, to heighten awareness of and interest in environmental concerns and, as appropriate, to facilitate environmental cooperation with foreign nations.

2-3. *Actions Included.* Agencies in their procedures under Section 2-1 shall establish procedures by which their officers having ultimate responsibility for authorizing and approving actions in one of the following categories encompassed by this Order, take into consideration in making decisions concerning such actions, a document described in Section 2-4(a):

(a) major Federal actions significantly affecting the environment of the global commons outside the jurisdiction of any nation (e.g., the oceans or Antarctica);

(b) major Federal actions significantly affecting the environment of a foreign nation not participating with the United States and not otherwise involved in the action;

(c) major Federal actions significantly affecting the environment of a foreign nation which provide to that nation:

(1) a product, or physical project producing a principal product or an emission or effluent, which is prohibited or strictly regulated by Federal law in the United States because its toxic effects on the environment create a serious public health risk; or

(2) a physical project which in the United States is prohibited or strictly regulated by Federal law to protect the environment against radioactive substances.

(d) major Federal actions outside the United States, its territories and possessions which significantly affect natural or ecological resources of global importance designated for protection under this subsection by the President, or, in the case of such a resource protected by international agreement binding on the United States, by the Secretary of State. Recommendations to the President under this subsection shall be accompanied by the views of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Secretary of State.

2-4. *Applicable Procedures.* (a) There are the following types of documents to be used in connection with actions described in Section 2-3:

(i) environmental impact statements (including generic, program and specific statements);

(ii) bilateral or multilateral environmental studies, relevant or related to the proposed action, by the United States and one more foreign nations, or by an international body or organization in which the United States is a member or participant; or

(iii) concise reviews of the environmental issues involved, including environmental assessments, summary environmental analyses or other appropriate documents.

(b) Agencies shall in their procedures provide for preparation of documents described in Section 2-4(a), with respect to actions described in Section 2-3, as follows:

(i) for effects described in Section 2-3(a), an environmental impact statement described in Section 2-4(a)(i);

(ii) for effects described in Section 2-3(b), a document described in Section 2-4(a)(ii) or (iii), as determined by the agency;

(iii) for effects described in Section 2-3(c), a document described in Section 2-4(a)(ii) or (iii), as determined by the agency;

(iv) for effects described in Section 2-3(d), a document described in Section 2-4(a)(i), (ii) or (iii), as determined by the agency.

Such procedures may provide that an agency need not prepare a new document when a document described in Section 2-4(a) already exists.

(c) Nothing in this Order shall serve to invalidate any existing regulations of any agency which have been adopted pursuant to court order or pursuant to judicial settlement of any case or to prevent any agency from providing in its procedures for measures in addition to those provided for herein to further the purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act and other environmental laws, including the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act and the Deepwater Port Act, consistent with the foreign and national security policies of the United States.

(d) Except as provided in Section 2-5(b), agencies taking action encompassed by this Order shall, as soon as feasible, inform other Federal agencies with

relevant expertise of the availability of environmental documents prepared under this Order.

Agencies in their procedures under Section 2-1 shall make appropriate provision for determining when an affected nation shall be informed in accordance with Section 3-2 of this Order of the availability of environmental documents prepared pursuant to those procedures.

In order to avoid duplication of resources, agencies in their procedures shall provide for appropriate utilization of the resources of other Federal agencies with relevant environmental jurisdiction or expertise.

2-5. *Exemptions and Considerations.* (a) Notwithstanding Section 2-3, the following actions are exempt from this Order:

(i) actions not having a significant effect on the environment outside the United States as determined by the agency;

(ii) actions taken by the President;

(iii) actions taken by or pursuant to the direction of the President or Cabinet officer when the national security or interest is involved or when the action occurs in the course of an armed conflict;

(iv) intelligence activities and arms transfers;

(v) export licenses or permits or export approvals, and actions relating to nuclear activities except actions providing to a foreign nation a nuclear production or utilization facility as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, or a nuclear waste management facility;

(vi) votes and other actions in international conferences and organizations;

(vii) disaster and emergency relief action.

(b) Agency procedures under Section 2-1 implementing Section 2-4 may provide for appropriate modifications in the contents, timing and availability of documents to other affected Federal agencies and affected nations, where necessary to:

(i) enable the agency to decide and act promptly as and when required;

(ii) avoid adverse impacts on foreign relations or infringement in fact or appearance of other nations' sovereign responsibilities, or

(iii) ensure appropriate reflection of:

(1) diplomatic factors;

(2) international commercial, competitive and export promotion factors;

(3) needs for governmental or commercial confidentiality;

(4) national security considerations;

(5) difficulties of obtaining information and agency ability to analyze meaningfully environmental effects of a proposed action; and

(6) the degree to which the agency is involved in or able to affect a decision to be made.

(c) Agency procedure under Section 2-1 may provide for categorical exclusions and for such exemptions in addition to those specified in subsection (a) of this Section as may be necessary to meet emergency circumstances, situations involving exceptional foreign policy and national security sensitivities and other such special circumstances. In utilizing such additional exemp-

tions agencies shall, as soon as feasible, consult with the Department of State and the Council on Environmental Quality.

(d) The provisions of Section 2–5 do not apply to actions described in Section 2–3(a) unless permitted by law.

Sec. 3.

3–1. *Rights of Action.* This Order is solely for the purpose of establishing internal procedures for Federal agencies to consider the significant effects of their actions on the environment outside the United States, its territories and possessions, and nothing in this Order shall be construed to create a cause of action.

3–2. *Foreign Relations.* The Department of State shall coordinate all communications by agencies with foreign governments concerning environmental agreements and other arrangements in implementation of this Order.

3–3. *Multi-Agency Actions.* Where more than one Federal agency is involved in an action or program, a lead agency, as determined by the agencies involved, shall have responsibility for implementation of this Order.

3–4. *Certain Terms.* For purposes of this Order, "environment" means the natural and physical environment and excludes social, economic and other environments; and an action significantly affects the environment if it does significant harm to the environment even though on balance the agency believes the action to be beneficial to the environment. The term "export approvals" in Section 2–5(a)(v) does not mean or include direct loans to finance exports.

3–5. *Multiple Impacts.* If a major Federal action having effects on the environment of the United States or the global commons requires preparation of an environmental impact statement, and if the action also has effects on the environment of a foreign nation, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared with respect to the effects on the environment of the foreign nation.

Jimmy Carter

The White House,
January 4, 1979.

[FR Doc. 79–869
Filed 1–5–79; 3:38 pm]

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS M. COSTLE
ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BEFORE THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 27, 1979

SPENDING SOME POPULARITY:
The Politics of Hazardous Waste Management

Once, at a formal dinner, Winston Churchill had the misfortune to be seated next to a lady of high rank who detested his opinions, his policies, and him. After an hour or so of acrimonious conversation, she finally leaned over to him and hissed, "Sir, if I were your wife, I'd pour strychnine in your tea." "Madam," Churchill replied, "If I were your husband, I'd drink it."

That story is apropos of absolutely nothing. I just wanted to tell it. Actually, I stumbled over it in my mental attic while searching for another Churchill quote . . . one that has to do with making tough political decisions. On another occasion, Churchill was warned by an aide that if he took a certain course of action, he would lose a considerable amount of public support. Churchill asked, "What's the use of popularity if you're not willing to spend some of it in a good cause?"

Churchill's point seems to me to apply to this hazardous waste issue in an ironic way. Certainly safeguarding the public from the deadly legacy of hazardous wastes is a good cause. Moreover, since Love Canal and a dozen similar disasters hit the headlines and our national consciousness, it is a highly visible

cause, and one that the public will support. But managing those wastes -- not only those inherited from the past, but those generated now and in the future -- will call for some decisions that will antagonize the same public we are trying to protect. In the course of doing our jobs, we are going to have to spend some popularity.

The dimensions of this problem are awesome. Industry produces about 35 million metric tons of hazardous waste a year. Of this 35 million, 90 percent is handled under practices that will not meet new federal standards . . . either disposal in non-secure ponds, lagoons, and landfills, or incineration without proper safeguards. Establishing control over this volume of waste will involve 270,000 waste-generating facilities, 10,000 transporters, and 30,000 storage or disposal sites.

Both the dimensions of this problem and the fact that its sources are so diffused throughout the country -- in every state, and in thousands of localities -- create delicate political problems. None of us is responsible for the Love Canal, or for its appalling siblings in other states. Industry is . . . and, where we can assign responsibility, we shall compel individual corporations -- through the courts, if necessary -- to shoulder the financial burden of repairing the damage their wastes have caused.

In the case of companies that have gone out of business, however, or of those whose assets cannot begin to compensate for the damage, some unit of government will have to accept responsibility. Our citizens do not care which unit of government does the job; they just want it done.

Yet our citizens may prove to be the greatest barrier to effective action. For -- if early reactions are a reliable barometer of their feelings -- they are agreed on two points: first, they want hazardous wastes managed safely; but second, they do not want such wastes managed in their own communities.

Thus the question of political responsibility is not academic. Any mayor may fear that it would mean political suicide to allow a new hazardous-waste site to be located in his town. Similarly, pressures are bound to rise -- they already have -- for governors to prohibit the transportation of hazardous wastes through their states from another . . . or the acceptance of such wastes from beyond their borders. In such contexts, action on hazardous waste management is likely to be held up by repeated chants of "Not here . . . Not here . . . Not here," while the problems -- environmental damage and threats to public health -- go unsolved.

What are the appropriate federal and state roles here?

We are dealing with two discrete issues: number one, the management of wastes that are being generated today, or will be generated in the future; and number two, with the management of wastes that have been improperly handled in the past.

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act deals only with today's wastes and those of the future. That Act requires EPA and the states to institute a "cradle-to-grave" management system; in it, Congress assigned the states an active role as consultants in developing federal standards, and -- if they choose, and can qualify -- as managers in carrying out the Act within their borders.

We are doing everything we can to help the states develop their programs. The Administration is asking Congress for $18.6 million in state grants for fiscal 1980, up from $15 million this year. These grants require no matching funds from states that are just beginning their programs.

Our best estimate now is that 41 of the 56 states and territories will assume management of a hazardous waste program. I would urge all of you to do so, for EPA simply does not and will not have the resources to do this job for you. Moreover, there are sound reasons why you should take it on.

First, the failure by states to take the initiative in developing a program will cost them business and jobs. I am told that one corporation decided to locate a product line on

the West Coast for the single reason that no nearby hazardous waste sites were available elsewhere.

For the last few decades, industry has taken more and more variables into account when deciding to locate a new plant. Early on, those variables included proximity to rail and truck transportation, to raw materials, to abundant water supplies, and to cheap power. Today, more and more, such environmental factors as quality of air and water have begun to figure in the corporate calculus. From now on, because of legal liabilities connected with hazardous-waste disasters, industry will look for states that provide management sites that meet federal standards. I understand that damage suits filed as a result of Love Canal alone already total $2 billion. Thus the availability of an approved site may become not just one more variable, but the dominant variable, in a corporate decision to locate, expand, or even close down a facility.

Second, it is obvious that the public will expect their elected officials to provide an effective waste-management program in every state; their health is at stake. Refusal by governors to establish secure facilities will not protect their citizens from disaster. On the contrary, such a refusal will simply encourage "midnight dumping" by the outlaws of our technological society. State law may provide for indemnity against such criminals, to be sure; but such legal provisions are next to useless when damages far exceed the assets of fly-

by-night operators. Again and again, in cases where responsibility cannot be fixed, or where the original owners cannot pay for the damage they have caused, the state has been stuck with the bill.

And that bill can be awesome, as has been demonstrated by the costs of correcting situations caused by improperly managed wastes from the past. Almost every such situation reinforces a homely but important truth: it's a lot cheaper to do the job right the first time, than to go back and correct it years later.

So far, for example, New York has spent at least $23 million to evacuate families from the Love Canal area, purchase their homes, and control the chemicals oozing there. We estimate that proper control would have cost $4 million . . . and that's in 1979 dollars. Back in 1950, control costs would have been about $1.4 million.

Similarly, costs to North Carolina for cleaning up PCBs illegally sprayed along more than 200 miles of roadside have been estimated at from $2 to $12 million. State officials hope to find a cheaper solution . . . but in any case, proper disposition of those wastes would originally have cost only $100,000.

Finally, we estimate that an investment of about $200,000 would have made the Life Sciences plant in Hopewell, Virginia, safe for the production of Kepone. So far, court judgments against the companies involved total $12 million; that figure

does not include damage suits settled out of court. And it would cost as much as $8 billion to clean up the James River . . . if that can be done, ever.

We hear a lot of criticism these days about the costs of environmental protection; as these figures illustrate, we ought to give equal thought to the costs of environmental neglect. Such figures also demonstrate the need for a much more massive hazardous waste program than any of us -- including Congress -- had anticipated. Presently, there are no resources to respond to waste emergencies, or to contain and clean up bad sites as they are discovered.

Clearly the states cannot handle this problem themselves. Industry, which created the problem, must contribute to its solution. Accordingly, we are preparing legislative proposals to create a fund, based on a fee assessed against the generators of wastes, to assist in financing necessary damage-control.

State responsibility for hazardous waste-management does not necessarily mean that each state must act alone. On the contrary, cooperation with other states can offer economic and environmental benefits. In New England, for example, six governors have initiated a federal-state-industry partnership aimed at developing a regional waste-management program. In a recent article, Governor Garrahy of Rhode Island offered a sound rationale for such cooperation:

"Siting, developing, and operating the necessary treatment and disposal facilities within each state," he wrote, "encourage unnecessary duplication of expensive facilities. In states where the economics of waste facilities does not attract private businesses, the state would be faced with the choice of constructing and operating the facilities with state funds, or with the loss of existing or potential new industry . . .. The volume of waste generated within individual states seldom justifies the contruction of complex facilities to serve each state."

At the opposite pole from cooperating with each other, some states may be tempted to try excluding wastes from others. That just won't work; we cannot continue shipping waste around from one stop to another, like Charlie on the MTA. Hazardous waste will come to rest somewhere; much better that it goes to a site designed to handle it properly, than that it simply disappears . . . and makes its appearance known years later, with ugly results that we cannot control.

Whatever the evolution of federal and state programs on the management of hazardous waste, the critical issue remains the political one. It might seem easier to walk away from the problem and leave it to the feds; almost every possible waste-management site is in somebody's back yard. But we have got to confront the unpleasant necessity for selecting and choosing

sites despite local opposition to the choice . . . and I think we will all be better off if state officials -- with their knowledge of local conditions -- undertake this responsibility, rather than leaving it to an EPA technician from a regional office two states away.

Every state, I suggest, needs to establish a process -- consistent with its own Constitution and laws -- for making decisions on the siting of hazardous waste facilities. That process must be one that the public will judge environmentally sound and politically fair. Above all, that process must go beyond debate and produce decisions.

By any traditional standard, hazardous-waste management is the least attractive of all possible issues. Yet it is obviously critical to the health of our citizens and our economy. It's a good cause . . . and I hope you will agree that it justifies our spending the necessary popularity on it.

Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
722 JACKSON PLACE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

January 19, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR NEPA LIAISONS

SUBJECT: Agency Implementing Procedures Under CEQ's NEPA Regulations

Introduction

On November 29, 1978 the Council on Environmental Quality issued regulations implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA regulations"). The regulations are binding on all Federal agencies and were developed through interagency and public consultation, review and comment. The regulations appear at pages 55978-56007 of Volume 43 of the Federal Register.

Section 1507.3 of the NEPA regulations provides that each agency shall adopt procedures implementing the NEPA regulations by July 30, 1979 ("agency implementing procedures").* The purpose of this memorandum is to provide Federal agencies with general guidance for developing these implementing procedures.**

---

* Implementing procedures for programs administered under Section 102(2)(D) of NEPA or under Section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 must also be adopted by July 30, 1979. However, Section 1506.12 provides that the procedures for these programs will not become effective until November 30, 1979 -- four months after the deadline for their adoption. This four month hiatus has been established to allow State and local agencies involved in these programs to adjust their decisionmaking to new implementing procedures.

On a separate point, Section 1506.12(a) also provides that any agency may proceed under these regulations at an earlier time. By this we mean that an agency may either adopt and place into effect implementing procedures before the July 30, 1979 deadline, if approved by the Council, or, for selected proposals, conduct its environmental reviews under the regulations before that time. Agencies administering programs under Section 102(2)(D) of NEPA or under Section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 may proceed under the regulations before November 30, 1979 with the consent of the State or local agencies involved.

** In developing this memorandum we have consulted with, circulated drafts to, and met with a number of the NEPA liaisons from agencies which prepare significant numbers of EISs. We appreciate their contribution.

Finally, in developing implementing procedures, agencies must allow time for review by the Council and the public. Section 1507.3(a) of the NEPA regulations establishes a three-step process leading to adoption of final procedures by July 30, 1979: Agencies shall consult with the Council in developing proposed implementing procedures. Agencies shall then publish their proposed procedures in the Federal Register for public review and comment. As the last step, and following changes made in response to comments received during the review period, agencies shall submit the final version of their proposed procedures for review by the Council for conformity with the Act and the NEPA regulations. The Council will complete its review within 30 days. The Council may thereafter make public the results of its reviews.

To ensure that this process is concluded by July 30, 1979, the Council recommends that agencies publish their proposed procedures in the Federal Register for comment no later than April 1, 1979 and submit by June 1, 1979 the final version of the procedures to the Council for review. Please note that the regulations go into effect and are binding throughout the government on July 30, 1979, regardless of whether an individual agency has adopted its procedures.

Once in effect, agency implementing procedures shall be filed with the Council, published in the Federal Register and made readily available to the public. Please note that Section 1507.3(a) of the regulations requires agencies continuously to review their policies and procedures and in consultation with the Council to revise them as necessary to ensure full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act.

Guidance for Developing Agency Implementing Procedures

We have enclosed with this memorandum a copy of the "NEPA Procedures Checklist" which the Council will use in evaluating agency implementing procedures. Many sections of the regulations will need no elaboration by agencies. Those sections of the regulations which must be addressed in agency procedures are marked with asterisks. Other sections described in the checklist or appearing in the regulations may be addressed, at the option of an agency, to further provide for implementation of the NEPA regulations in the agency's environmental review process.

The test for evaluating agency procedures is whether they provide the means to incorporate the standards of the regulations into agency planning and decisionmaking. The question we will ask, in other words, is whether the procedures will give practical effect to the provisions of the regulations in the agency's environmental review process.

In what follows, we elaborate several aspects of our guidance for developing agency implementing procedures.

A. CARRYING OUT NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND GOALS

Section 1500.1(a) of the NEPA regulations states that

> "The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is our basic national charter for protection of the environment. It establishes policy, sets goals (section 101), and provides means (section 102) for carrying out the policy. Section 102(2) contains 'action-forcing' provisions to make sure that federal agencies act according to the letter and spirit of the Act. The regulations that follow implement Section 102(2). Their purpose is to tell federal agencies what they must do to comply with the procedures and achieve the goals of the Act. The President, the federal agencies, and the courts share responsibility for enforcing the Act so as to achieve the substantive requirements of section 101."

In addition, Section 1500.1(c) states that

> "Ultimately, of course, it is not better documents but better decisions that count. NEPA's purpose is not to generate paperwork -- even excellent paperwork -- but to foster excellent action...."

These statements of purpose place the procedural requirements of NEPA in the context of national environmental policies and goals and establish guiding principles for the development of agency implementing procedures.

B. ASSURING THAT THE NEPA PROCESS CORRESPONDS WITH MAJOR DECISION POINTS FOR PRINCIPAL AGENCY PROGRAMS

The NEPA regulations are designed to ensure that the data and analysis developed during the environmental review process is made available to agency planners and decisionmakers at the time when it will be of most value to them in formulating, reviewing and deciding upon proposals for agency action. Section 1501.2 provides, for example, that "[a]gencies shall integrate the NEPA process with other planning at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values ...." Section 1501.2(b) states that "[e]nvironmental documents and appropriate analyses shall be circulated and reviewed at the same time as other planning documents."

In addition, Section 1502.5 provides that an "agency shall commence preparation of an environmental impact statement as close as possible to the time the agency is developing or is presented with a proposal" so that the statement "can serve practically as an important contribution to the decisionmaking process...." In the case of Federal projects, the EIS shall be prepared at the "feasibility analysis (go-no go) stage" (Section 1502.5(a)). For projects initiated elsewhere, the process shall commence "no later than immediately after the application is received" (Section 1502.5(b)). Agencies are encouraged in such cases to initiate their analyses even earlier.

Morever, Section 1505.1(d) directs agencies to adopt implementing procedures requiring that relevant environmental documents, comments and responses "accompany the proposal through existing agency review processes so that agency officials use the statement in making decisions." Agency implementing procedures must also ensure that "the alternatives considered by the decisionmaker are encompassed by the range of alternatives" discussed in these environmental materials (Section 1505.1(e)).

Agency implementing procedures must serve as the vehicle for ensuring that these critical issues of timing and integration are properly established in agency planning and decisionmaking processes. It is for this reason that Section 1505.1(b) provides that agency implementing procedures shall include "[d]esignating the major decision points for the agency's principal programs likely to have a significant effect on the human environment assuring that the NEPA process corresponds with them."

In order to conform with this section, an agency's procedures should include such information as a description of when the NEPA process starts,i.e. "the earliest possible time;" a designation of major decision points; an identification of the official making the major decisions; a description of what is decided at each major decision point; and a description of the environmental data and analysis that are to be made available to the decisionmaker at each major decision point.

Charts and other graphic aids may be useful in presenting this material.

C. IDENTIFYING TYPICAL CLASSES OF ACTION FOR SIMILAR TREATMENT IN THE NEPA PROCESS

Section 1507.3(c)(2) of the NEPA regulations provides that agency implementing procedures shall include:

> "(2) Specific criteria for and identification of those typical classes of action:
>
> (i) Which normally do require environmental impact statements.
>
> (ii) Which normally do not require either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment (categorical exclusions (Sec. 1508.4)).
>
> (iii) Which normally require environmental assessments but not necessarily environmental impact statements."

Section 1501.4 describes the way in which these categories are to be used in determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.

Section 1508.4 defines "categorical exclusion" to mean "a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant

effect on the human environment..." (the category described in 1507.3(b)(2)(ii) above). Section 1508.4 also states, however, that agency implementing procedures "shall provide for extraordinary circumstances in which a normally excluded action may have a significant environmental effect." When these extraordinary circumstances occur, the action or actions would not be treated as categorically excluded from the NEPA process.

Three things should be noted about this aspect of agency implementing procedures. First, Section 1508.18 of the regulations states that

> "(b) Federal actions tend to fall within one of the following categories:
>
> "(1) Adoption of official policy, such as rules, regulations, and interpretations adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq.; treaties and international conventions or agreements; formal documents establishing an agency's policies which will result in or substantially alter agency programs.
>
> "(2) Adoption of formal plans, such as official documents prepared or approved by federal agencies which guide or prescribe alternative uses of federal resources, upon which future agency actions will be based.
>
> "(3) Adoption of programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program or executive directive.
>
> "(4) Approval of specific projects, such as construction or management activities located in a defined geographic area. Projects include actions approved by permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted activities."

Agencies should review this list of actions for purposes of establishing typical classes of action under Section 1507.3(b)(2).

Second, it is not sufficient simply to identify and categorize typical classes of agency actions under Section 1507.3(b)(2) of the regulations. Agency implementing procedures must also contain the "specific criteria" used for this purpose.

Third, categorical exclusions must be explicitly qualified as required by Section 1508.4. For each such exclusion, agency implementing procedures must describe at least in general terms "the extraordinary circumstances in which a normally excluded action may have a significant environmental effect" and include a description of the procedures which would be followed by the agency in recognizing such an exception.

D. INTEGRATING NEPA REQUIREMENTS WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

One important purpose of the regulations is "[i]ntegrating NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements" (Sections 1500.4(k), 1500.5(g)). Section 1502.25(a) provides, for example, that:

> "To the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with and integrated with environmental impact analyses and related surveys and studies required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. Sec. 661 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 470 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531 et seq.), and other environmental review laws and executive orders."

To this end, Section 1501.7(a)(6) requires that as part of the scoping process agencies identify other environmental review and consultation requirements so that other required analyses and studies may be prepared concurrently with, and integrated with, the environmental impact statement (see Sections 1502.25(b), 1503.3(c), (d)).

We have attached as Appendix C a list of the major environmental review and consultation requirements for Federal agencies. Agency implementing procedures should identify those requirements that apply to agency actions, and the analyses, surveys and studies which they entail. The implementing procedures should also describe the process by which these requirements are met and indicate how this process will be made to run concurrently with, and integrated with, the NEPA process in terms of timing, agency personnel involved, public review and comment, publication and use of documents, research and analysis, and so forth. However, agencies should not allow the incorporation of these other more narrowly focused environmental review and consultation requirements to detract from the comprehensive approach required by NEPA.

E. FACILITATING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR PRIVATE APPLICANTS

Section 1501.2(d) of the NEPA regulations states that each agency shall:

> "(d) Provide for cases where actions are planned by private applicants or other non-Federal entities before Federal involvement so that:
>
> "(1) Policies or designated staff are available to advise potential applicants of studies or other information foreseeably required for later Federal action.

Members of the Council's staff will be contacting you in the near future regarding a schedule for developing implementing procedures. We would like to become involved in your efforts early to avoid a last-minute crunch later in the year. We have attached as Appendix A a list of our staff members who will be available for consultation throughout the process.

Procedural Considerations

In developing implementing procedures under the NEPA regulations, agencies should bear in mind the following important considerations: First, the purpose of agency procedures is both to provide agency personnel with additional, more specific direction for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA and to inform the public and State and local officials of how the NEPA regulations will be implemented in agency decisionmaking. Agency procedures should therefore provide Federal personnel with the direction they need to implement NEPA on a day-to-day basis. The procedures must also provide a clear and uncomplicated picture of what those outside the Federal government may do to become involved in the environmental review process under NEPA.

Second, the NEPA regulations provide that each agency shall as necessary adopt procedures to supplement the regulations (Section 1507.3). Major agency subunits are also encouraged (with the consent of the department) to adopt their own procedures. Departmental procedures would then address issues of general concern for all of its agencies; an individual agency's procedures would address the particulars of its own planning and decisionmaking.

Third, agency implementing procedures are not required to, nor is it desirable that they address every section of the regulations. The sections which must be addressed are identified in Section 1507.3(b). This is detailed in the "NEPA Procedures Checklist" enclosed herewith. Agencies are encouraged to address other sections where this would further implementation of the NEPA regulations.

Fourth, while the format for implementing procedures is largely a matter of agency discretion, the following points should be noted:

(1) By Executive Order 11991, the President directed the Council to establish a single and definitive set of uniform standards for implementing NEPA government-wide. Therefore, while agencies may quote the regulations in their implementing procedures, they shall not attempt to restate or otherwise paraphrase the regulations (Section 1507.3(a)). Agencies shall confine themselves to procedures which make the standards established by the NEPA regulations effective in the context of their decisionmaking.

(2) Agencies may quote from the regulations to provide a context for implementing procedures. For example, an agency may quote from Section 1508.9 on environmental assessments as a means of introducing its own environmental assessment procedures. In addition, agencies may produce a single, self-contained document containing quotations from the NEPA regulations so that agency personnel need not refer back and forth from NEPA regulations to implementing procedures in conducting environmental reviews. However, whenever the NEPA regulations are quoted they must be quoted verbatim, properly cited, and set off in some fashion (e.g., italics, boldfaced type) so that the reader can readily distinguish between the NEPA regulations and agency implementing procedures.

You will understand the competing considerations that guide us here. On the one hand we intend the agency procedures to be the minimum length possible consistent with the regulations and this memorandum. On the other hand, we do not want to place readers in the position of having constantly to refer to other documents.

(3) Implementing procedures should cross-reference relevant sections of the regulations where they are not quoted in full. It is important to link agency procedures with corresponding sections in the NEPA regulations so that agency personnel will have a complete picture of the standards which govern the environmental review process.

(4) Agency implementing procedures should where practicable follow the same sequence of procedural steps appearing in the NEPA regulations. It will be easier to work with both documents if the procedures and the regulations take a parallel approach.

Fifth, there is no need to include every detail of agency decisionmaking in the implementing procedures. The NEPA regulations contemplate the publication of further explanatory guidance with specific information that may not be appropriate for agency implementing procedures (Section 1507.3(a)). This further guidance, which may be in the form of an operating manual, administrative directives, explanatory bulletins, and other publications, must also be reviewed by the Council and made available to the public.

Sixth, agencies with similar programs should consult with each other and the Council to coordinate their implementing procedures, especially for programs requesting similar information from applicants (Section 1507.3(a)). Opportunities exist to improve the environmental review process through a consistent approach to similar Federal programs. It is important that agencies combine efforts in developing this approach and ensure that, once developed, it is uniformly adopted in agency implementing procedures. We have attached as Appendix B a list of NEPA liaisons for all agencies who should be contacted for this purpose.

"(2) The Federal agency consults early with appropriate State and local agencies and Indian tribes and with interested private persons and organizations when its own involvement is reasonably foreseeable."

Section 1507.3(b)(1) states that agency implementing procedures shall include the procedures required by Section 1501.2(d).

To fulfill these requirements, agency implementing procedures should accomplish the following:

(a) Identify types of actions initiated by private parties, State and local agencies and other non-governmental entities for which agency involvement is reasonably foreseeable;

(b) Establish policies for advising potential applicants of studies or other information foreseeably required for later Federal action including the NEPA process. Such policies should provide for full public notice that agency advice on such matters is available, publications containing that advice such as a handbook for applicants, and early consultation in cases where agency involvement is reasonably foreseeable;

(c) Designate agency personnel responsible for making the identifications and implementing the policies under subsections (a) and (b), above.

F. MITIGATION AND MONITORING

Section 1505.3 of the NEPA regulations states that

"Agencies may provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases. Mitigation (Section 1505.2(c)) and other conditions established in the environmental impact statement or during its review and committed as part of the decision shall be implemented by the lead agency or other appropriate consenting agency. The lead agency shall:

"(a) Include appropriate conditions in grants, permits or other approvals.

"(b) Condition funding of actions on mitigation.

"(c) Upon request, inform cooperating or commenting agencies on progress in carrying out mitigation measures which they have proposed and which were adopted by the agency making the decision.

"(d) Upon request, make available to the public the results of relevant monitoring."

Agencies are encouraged to address these requirements in their implementing procedures.

G. OTHER MATTERS

1. Making Environmental Documents a Part of the Record in Administrative Proceedings

Section 1505.1(c) provides that agencies shall adopt procedures which require "that relevant environmental documents, comments, and responses be part of the record in formal rulemaking or adjudicatory proceedings." In addition, Section 1502.9(c)(3) of the NEPA regulations provides that agencies "[s]hall adopt procedures for introducing a supplement [to an enviornmental impact statement] into its formal administrative record, if such a record exists. Agency procedures must include provisions for implementing these requirements of the NEPA regulations. Section 1507.3(b)(1).

2. Informing the Public on the Status of the NEPA Process

Section 1506.6(e) of the NEPA regulations provides that agency implementing procedures shall indicate "where interested persons can get information or status reports on environmental impact statements and other elements of the NEPA process." See Section 1507.3(b)(1). Similarly, Section 1507.2(a) provides that "[a]gencies shall designate a person to be responsible for overall review of agency NEPA compliance."

3. Identifying Agencies With Special Expertise and Jurisdiction By Law

Some agencies have already made arrangements among themselves for cooperation in the environmental review process. Agency implementing procedures should describe the arrangements which exist, identify letters of agreement, memoranda of understanding and other written documents reflecting the arrangements, and indicate how these documents may be obtained by members of the public.

The Council is currently preparing a list of agencies with special expertise in prescribed resource areas and an analysis of agency jurisdiction by law under Federal statutes. When published, this information will assist lead agencies in identifying potential cooperating agencies for preparing environmental impact statements.

4. Cooperating With State and Local Agencies

Section 1506.2 of the NEPA regulations provides for cooperation with State and local agencies to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements. To this end, we have attached as Appendix D a list of State and local entities with environmental review requirements that appeared in the Council's 1977 Annual Report on Environmental Quality.

We recognize that developing agency implementing procedures will be a challenging job. We will be available for consultation throughout this process and are prepared to meet with you to discuss the implementing procedures at the earliest mutually convenient time.

NICHOLAS C. YOST
General Counsel

Enclosures

FEBRUARY

COUNCIL ON ENVIRON

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATE
ALABAMA	JEFFERSON	FINAL	CONDOVA-UNION-BROW
		DRAFT	NORTH-CENTRAL JEFF
ALASKA		FINAL	GREEN LAKE PROJECT
ARIZONA	COCONINO	DRAFT	WESTERN SPRUCE BUD
		FINAL	SNOW BOWL SKI AREA
	MARICOPA	DRAFT	LOWER SALT RIVER R
	PIMA	DRAFT	FLIGHT OPERATIONS
		DRAFT	TUCSON FM BROADCAS
ARKANSAS	BAXTER	FINAL	LAKEVIEW WASTEWATE
	PULASKI	DRAFT	JOHN L. MCCLELLAN
CALIFORNIA	SEVERAL	FINAL	OAKLAND AIR SERVIC
	INYO	FINAL	DEATH VALLEY ROAD,
	LOS ANGELES	DRAFT	PALMDALE INTERNATI
	MERCED	DRAFT	MERCED COUNTY STRE
	SAN DIEGO	DRAFT	MARINA/COLUMBIA RE
	SAN MATEO	FINAL	PILLAR POINT MARIN
COLORADO	ALAMOSA	FINAL	115KV TRANSMISSION
	ARAPAHOE	DRAFT	THE MESA, HAMPTON
	CHAFFEE	FINAL	115KV TRANSMISSION
	HINSDALE	FINAL	115KV TRANSMISSION
	JACKSON	DRAFT	ENCAMPMENT RIVER W
DISTRICT OF CO		FINAL	VA MEDICAL CENTER,
		SUPPLE	WASHINGTON D.C. CI
FLORIDA	SEVERAL	FINAL	CENTRAL FLORIDA PH
	BAY	FINAL	PANAMA CITY BEACHS
	DADE	DRAFT	GROVE ISLE (FAIR I
	HILLSBOROUGH	DRAFT	UPPER TAMPA BAY WA

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
BROWNS FERRY, TRANSMISSION LINE	90158	02-09-79	TVA
JEFFERSON COUNTY WATER SYSTEM	90142	02-05-79	HUD
JECT NO. 2818, SITKA	90145	02-06-79	FERC
BUDWORM, KAIBAB NF, GRAND CANYON NP	90159	02-09-79	USDA
AREA PROPOSAL, COCONINO NF	90215	02-28-79	USDA
ER RECREATION AREA, TONTO NF	90195	02-23-79	USDA
ONS IN THE SELLS AIRSPACE	90150	02-09-79	USAF
OCASTING CORPORATION, PERMIT	90202	02-23-79	FCC
WATER TREATMENT FACILITIES, GRANT	90211	02-27-79	EPA
LAN MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL	90193	02-22-79	VA
RVICE CASE, DOCKET 30699	90130	02-02-79	CAB
DAD, CA-168 TO D. VALLEY NAT'L MON.	81243	02-26-79	DOT
NATIONAL AIRPORT, PALMDALE	90149	02-08-79	DOT
STREAMS, FLOOD CONTROL	90199	02-23-79	COE
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	90128	02-01-79	HUD
ARINA, REGULATORY PERMIT	90212	02-27-79	COE
SION LINE, LAKE CITY TO CREEDE	90163	02-12-79	USDA
TON HILLS AT AURORA	90174	02-15-79	HUD
SION LINE, LAKE CITY TO CREEDE	90163	02-12-79	USDA
SION LINE, LAKE CITY TO CREEDE	90163	02-12-79	USDA
ER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90134	02-02-79	USDA
TER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	90171	02-13-79	VA
CIVIC CENTER, SITE LOCATION	90131	02-02-79	NCPC
PHOSPHATE INDUSTRY	90194	02-23-79	EPA
ACHS, EROSION, HURRICANE PROTECTION	90169	02-12-79	COE
ER ISLE) MARINA, MIAMI, PERMIT	90135	02-02-79	COE
WATERSHED	90162	02-12-79	USDA

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONM

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - E

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STATEME
FLORIDA	PASCO	DRAFT	UPPER TAMPA BAY WATE
	PINELLAS	DRAFT	UPPER TAMPA BAY WATE
GULF OF MEXICO		FINAL	STONE CRAB, FISHERY
			SUPPLESEADOCK APPLICATION
	SEVERAL	FINAL	OCS LEASE SALE 58,
IDAHO	SEVERAL	FINAL	RIVER OF NO RETURN
		FINAL	STAR PLANNING UNIT,
ILLINOIS	ADAMS	FINAL	FAP 408, BARRY TO Q
	COOK	FINAL	LITTLE CALUMET RIVE
	PIKE	FINAL	FAP 408, BARRY TO Q
	WILL	FINAL	LITTLE CALUMET RIVE
INDIANA	MONROE	DRAFT	THIRD STREET CORRID
IOWA	BLACK HAWK	FINAL	I-380, WATERLOO TO
	CLAYTON	FINAL	ELKADER BYPASS, IOW
	DICKINSON	DRAFT	US 71, MILFORD TO S
KENTUCKY	LAWRENCE	DRAFT	US 23, LOUISA BY-PA
MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	DRAFT	VA REPLACEMENT MEDI
MASSACHUSETTS	PLYMOUTH	SUPPLE	PILGRIM NUCLEAR STA
	SUFFOLK	FINAL	CHELSEA WATERFRONT

PONMENTAL QUALITY

- BY STATE AND COUNTY

TEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
WATERSHED	90162	02-12-79	USDA
WATERSHED	90162	02-12-79	USDA
ERY MANAGEMENT PLAN, GULF OF MEX.	90113	02-08-79	DOC
ION AMENDMENT, TOPA, LICENSE	90198	02-23-79	DOT
8, WESTERN AND CENTRAL GULF	90201	02-23-79	DOI
RN WILDERNESS	90133	02-02-79	USDA
IT, KOOTENAI NF	90220	02-28-79	USDA
O QUINCY	90151	02-09-79	DOT
IVER WATERSHED	90161	02-12-79	USDA
O QUINCY	90151	02-09-79	DOT
IVER WATERSHED	90161	02-12-79	USDA
RIDOR, IN-37 TO IN-45/46 BYPASS	90179	02-16-79	DOT
TO CEDAR FALLS	90167	02-12-79	DOT
IOWA 13	90210	02-27-79	DOT
O SPIRIT LAKE, CONSTRUCTION	90147	02-06-79	DOT
-PASS, RELOCATION	90196	02-23-79	DOT
EDICAL CENTER, BALTIMORE	90192	02-22-79	VA
STATION, UNIT 2, ALTERNATIVE SITES	90184	02-16-79	NRC
ONT NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION	90217	02-28-79	HUD

COUNCIL ON

STATEMENT TITLE I

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS
MICHIGAN	ST. CLAIR	FINAL MI-29, RECON
MINNESOTA	HENNIPEN	FINAL LOCKS AND DA
	RAMSEY	FINAL LOCKS AND DA
	WASHINGTON	FINAL WOUDLAND MIL
MISSISSIPPI	SEVERAL	FINAL CONDOVA-UNIO
		FINAL ARKABUTLA, E
MONTANA	BIG HORN	FINAL SPWING CREEK
NATIONAL		FINAL TANK VESSELS
NEBRASKA	SCOTTS BLUFF	FINAL PROPOSED EXP
NEW MEXICO		FINAL PECOS RIVER
	BERNALILLO	DRAFT MIDDLE RIO G
	SANDOVAL	DRAFT MIDDLE RIO G
	VALENCIA	DRAFT MIDDLE RIO G
NEW YORK	GREENE	FINAL GREENE COUNT
	NIAGARA	FINAL CAYUGA STAT
NORTH CAROLINA	SEVERAL	DRAFT US 19, ANDRE
		SUPPLEMRIMARY HIGH
	CUMBERLAND	FINAL FAYETTEVILLE
	GASTON	DRAFT I-85, CHARLO
	MECKLENBURG	DRAFT I-85, CHARLO
OREGON	SEVERAL	DRAFT WALLOWA-WHIT

ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

LE INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
ECONSTRUCTION, ALGONAC	90190	02-21-79	DOT
D DAM NO. 1, REHABILITATION, ST. PAUL	90158	02-09-79	COE
D DAM NO. 1, REHABILITATION, ST. PAUL	90158	02-09-79	COE
HILLS DEVELOPMENT, WOODBURY	90172	02-13-79	HUD
UNION-BROWNS FERRY, TRANSMISSION LINE	90154	02-09-79	TVA
A, ENID, GRENADA, AND SARDIS LAKES, O/M	90141	02-05-79	COE
REEK MINE, MINING/RECLAMATION, PERMIT	90218	02-28-79	DOI
SELS ENGAGED IN DOMESTIC TRADE	90180	02-16-79	DOC
EXPANSION OF EXISTING WWT FACILITIES	90136	02-02-79	EPA
VER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	90203	02-26-79	DOI
IO GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION	90165	02-12-79	COE
IO GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION	90165	02-12-79	COE
IO GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION	90165	02-12-79	COE
OUNTY NUCLEAR POWERPLANT	90187	02-21-79	NRC
TATION, PERMIT, SOMERSET	90183	02-16-79	COE
NDREWS BYPASS TO US 19/NC-28 INTERSECTION	90140	02-05-79	DOT
HIGHWAY EXTENSION, I-95 TO WILMINGTON	90214	02-28-79	DOT
VILLE AIRPORT CONNECTOR TO I-95	90152	02-09-79	DOT
HARLOTTE BYPASS, NC-273 TO US 29/NC-49	90204	02-26-79	DOT
HARLOTTE BYPASS, NC-273 TO US 29/NC-49	90204	02-26-79	DOT
-WHITMAN NF TEN-YEAR TIMBER RESOURCE PLAN	90143	02-05-79	USDA

COUNCIL ON E

STATEMENT TITLE IN

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS
OREGON	SEVERAL	FINAL VEGETATION MA
		FINAL SIUSLAW NATIO
		FINAL SEWAGE SLUDGE
	BENTON	DRAFT THE CORVALLIS
	CROOK	FINAL UCMOCO-CROOKE
	GRANT	FINAL UCMOCO-CROOKE
	KLAMATH	FINAL FREMONT NATIO
	LAKE	FINAL FREMONT NATIO
	WHEELER	FINAL UCMOCO-CROOKE
PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	FINAL PLACING OF SO
PROGRAMMATIC		SUPPLEMX; MILESTON
REGULATORY		DRAFT TANKER SAFETY
		DRAFT ESSENTIAL AGR
		FINAL INCINERATION
SEVERAL	SEVERAL	DRAFT OHIO RIVER NA
SOUTH DAKOTA	JACKSON	DRAFT BADLANDS NAT
	PENNINGTON	DRAFT BADLANDS NAT
	SHANNON	DRAFT BADLANDS NAT
TENNESSEE		FINAL CONDOVA-UNIO
	BLOUNT	DRAFT I=-33, BYPAS
	SHELBY	DRAFT STONEBRIDGE
		FINAL NORTHWOOD HI
TEXAS		FINAL PECOS RIVER
		SUPPLESEADOCK APPL
	BRAZORIA	FINAL GULF INTRACO
	CALHOUN	DRAFT VISTRON PETR
	EL PASO	FINAL NORTHWEST EL

ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

E INDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
N MANAGEMENT, HERBICIDES, OREGON FORESTS	90144	02-06-79	DOI
ATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90175	02-15-79	USDA
UDGE DISPOSAL, PORTLAND	90188	02-21-79	EPA
LLIS BYPASS, CORVALLIS	90146	02-06-79	DOT
OOKED RIVER PLANNING UNIT, OCHOCO NF	90164	02-12-79	USDA
OOKED RIVER PLANNING UNIT, OCHOCO NF	90164	02-12-79	USDA
ATIONAL FOREST, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90207	02-26-79	USDA
ATIONAL FOREST, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90207	02-26-79	USDA
OOKED RIVER PLANNING UNIT, OCHOCO NF	90164	02-12-79	USDA
F SOLID FILL, DELAWARE RIVER, PERMIT	90182	02-16-79	COE
STONE II, AIR MOBILE ALTERNATIVE	90181	02-16-79	USAF
FETY AND POLLUTION PREVENTION	90155	02-09-79	DOT
AGRICULTURAL USES OF NATURAL GAS	90206	02-26-79	USDA
ION OF WASTES AT SEA, OCEAN DUMPING	90173	02-14-79	STAT
R NAVIGATION PROJECT, O/M	90148	02-06-79	COE
NATIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN	90125	02-01-79	DOI
NATIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN	90125	02-01-79	DOI
NATIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN	90125	02-01-79	DOI
UNION-BROWNS FERRY, TRANSMISSION LINE	90154	02-09-79	TVA
PASS OF MARYVILLE, TN-115/TN-95 TO TN-73	90137	02-02-79	DOT
GE RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY, MEMPHIS	90200	02-23-79	HUD
HILLS SUBDIVISION	90209	02-27-79	HUD
VER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	90203	02-26-79	DOI
APPLICATION AMENDMENT, TDPA, LICENSE	90198	02-23-79	DOT
RACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHOCOLATE BAYOU	90177	02-15-79	COE
PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX, NDPES PERMIT	90219	02-28-79	EPA
T EL PASO JOINT VENTURE, EL PASO	90191	02-21-79	HUD

COUNCIL ON ENVI

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX

STATE	COUNTY	STATUS	STA
TEXAS	FAYETTE	DRAFT	FAYETTE POWER PR
	HARRIS	DRAFT	CYPRESS MEADOWS
		FINAL	THREE LAKES SUBD
	HUNT	FINAL	GREENVILLE RAILR
	MONTGOMERY	FINAL	LASALLE CROSSING
UTAH	EMERY	DRAFT	EMERY UNITS 3 AN
	GARFIELD	DRAFT	SHOOTERING CANYO
VIRGIN ISLANDS		DRAFT	VIRGIN ISLANDS C
VIRGINIA	CHESAPEAKE	DRAFT	LYNNHAVEN INLET,
	HANOVER	DRAFT	MNT FACILITIES,
WASHINGTON	FRANKLIN	DRAFT	ICE HARBOR LOCK
	KING	FINAL	ALDERBROOK ESTA
	SPOKANE	DRAFT	COMBINED SEWER C
	WALLA WALLA	DRAFT	ICE HARBOR LOCK
WEST VIRGINIA	MERCER	FINAL	BRUSH CREEK WATE
WISCONSIN	MARATHON	FINAL	WESTON GENERATI
	MILWAUKEE	DRAFT	PLANKINTON HOUSE
WYOMING	CARBON	DRAFT	CARBON BASIN ARE
	TETON	FINAL	JACKSON WASTEWA

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

NDEX - BY STATE AND COUNTY

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	ORIG AGENCY NUMBER
R PROJECT, NPDES PERMIT	90132	02-02-79	EPA
OWS SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90138	02-05-79	HUD
SUBDIVISION	90197	02-23-79	HUD
AILROAD DEMONSTRATION, US 69 CROSSING	90170	02-13-79	DOT
SING SUBDIVISION	90176	02-15-79	HUD
3 AND 4, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION	90189	02-21-79	DOI
ANYON URANIUM PROJECT, OPERATION	90156	02-09-79	NRC
DS COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	90129	02-01-79	DOC
LET, BAY & CONNECTING WATERS, DREDGING	90178	02-15-79	COE
ES, HANOVER CO. PHASE II AREA, GRANT	90213	02-28-79	EPA
OCK AND DAM, O&M, SNAKE RIVER	90166	02-12-79	COE
STATES, MASTER PLAN	90139	02-05-79	HUD
ER OVERFLOW ABATEMENT PROJECT, SPOKANE	90185	02-20-79	EPA
OCK AND DAM, O&M, SNAKE RIVER	90166	02-12-79	COE
WATERSHED	90157	02-09-79	USDA
ATING UNIT 3, WAUSAU, PERMIT	90127	02-01-79	COE
OUSE AND NORTH WING ADDITION	90205	02-26-79	HUD
AREA, COAL LEASING APPLICATION	90208	02-27-79	DOI
EWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM	90168	02-12-79	EPA

FEBRUARY
COUNCIL ON ENVI

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - E

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STAT
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD		
	FINAL	OAKLAND AIR SERVI
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE		
	DRAFT	ESSENTIAL AGRICUL
FOREST SERVICE		
	DRAFT	ENCAMPMENT RIVER
		WALLOWA-WHITMAN N
		WESTERN SPRUCE BU
		LOWER SALT RIVER
	FINAL	RIVER OF NO RETUR
		OCHOCO-CROOKED RI
		SIUSLAW NATIONAL
		FREMONT NATIONAL
		SNOW BOWL SKI ARE
		STAR PLANNING UNI
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION		
	FINAL	115KV TRANSMISSIO
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE		
	DRAFT	UPPER TAMPA BAY
	FINAL	BRUSH CREEK WATER
		LITTLE CALUMET RI
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE		
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION		
	FINAL	TANK VESSELS ENGA
NAT'L OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN.		
	DRAFT	VIRGIN ISLANDS CO
	FINAL	STONE CRAB, FISHE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AIR FORCE		
	DRAFT	FLIGHT OPERATIONS
	SUPPLEMMX:	MILESTONE II
DEPARTMENT OF HUD		
	DRAFT	CYPRESS MEADOWS S
		THE MESA, HAMPTON
		STONEBRIDGE RESID

UARY 1979
NVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

- BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
EHVICE CASE, DOCKET 30699	90130	02-02-79	(NONE)
ICULTURAL USES OF NATURAL GAS	90206	02-26-79	(NONE)
VER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY	90134	02-02-79	(NONE)
AN NF TEN-YEAR TIMBER RESOURCE PLAN	90143	02-05-79	(NONE)
E BUDWORM, KAIBAB NF, GRAND CANYON NP	90159	02-09-79	(NONE)
VER RECREATION AREA, TONTO NF	90195	02-23-79	(NONE)
ETURN WILDERNESS	90153	02-02-79	(NONE)
D RIVER PLANNING UNIT, OCHOCO NF	90164	02-12-79	(NONE)
NAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90175	02-15-79	(NONE)
NAL FOREST, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN	90207	02-26-79	(NONE)
AREA PROPOSAL, COCONINO NF	90215	02-28-79	(NONE)
UNIT, KOOTENAI NF	90220	02-28-79	(NONE)
SSION LINE, LAKE CITY TO CREEDE	90163	02-12-79	(NONE)
AY WATERSHED	90162	02-12-79	(NONE)
ATERSHED	90157	02-09-79	(NONE)
T RIVER WATERSHED	90161	02-12-79	(NONE)
ENGAGED IN DOMESTIC TRADE	90180	02-16-79	(NONE)
S COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	90129	02-01-79	(NONE)
ISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN, GULF OF MEX.	90113	02-08-79	(NONE)
IONS IN THE BELLS AIRSPACE	90150	02-09-79	(NONE)
E II, AIR MOBILE ALTERNATIVE	90181	02-16-79	(NONE)
WS SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE	90138	02-05-79	(NONE)
PTON HILLS AT AURORA	90174	02-15-79	(NONE)
ESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY, MEMPHIS	90200	02-23-79	(NONE)

COUNCIL ON

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX -

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	ST
DEPARTMENT OF HUD		
	DRAFT	PLANKINTON HOUS
	FINAL	ALDERBROOK ESTA
		WOODLAND HILLS
		LASALLE CROSSIN
		NORTHWEST EL PA
		THREE LAKES SUB
		NORTHWOOD HILLS
SECTION 104(H)		
	DRAFT	MARINA/COLUMBIA
		NORTH-CENTRAL J
	FINAL	CHELSEA WATERFR
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR		
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT		
	DRAFT	EMERY UNITS 3 A
		CARBON BASIN AR
	FINAL	VEGETATION MANA
		OCS LEASE SALE
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION		
	FINAL	PECOS RIVER BAS
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY		
	FINAL	SPRING CREEK MI
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE		
	DRAFT	BADLANDS NATIO
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	PALMDALE INTER
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION		
	DRAFT	TN-33, BYPASS
		US 19, ANDREWS
		THE CORVALLIS
		US 71, MILFORD
		THIRD STREET C
		US 23, LOUISA
		I-85, CHARLOTT
	FINAL	DEATH VALLEY N
		FAP 408, BARRY
		FAYETTEVILLE A
		I-380, WATERLO

IRONMENTAL QUALITY

EX - BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
HOUSE AND NORTH WING ADDITION	90205	02-26-79	(NONE)
ESTATES, MASTER PLAN	90139	02-05-79	(NONE)
LLS DEVELOPMENT, WOODBURY	90172	02-13-79	(NONE)
SSING SUBDIVISION	90176	02-15-79	(NONE)
L PASO JOINT VENTURE, EL PASO	90191	02-21-79	(NONE)
SUBDIVISION	90197	02-23-79	(NONE)
ILLS SUBDIVISION	90209	02-27-79	(NONE)
MBIA RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	90128	02-01-79	(NONE)
AL JEFFERSON COUNTY WATER SYSTEM	90142	02-05-79	(NONE)
ERFRONT NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION	90217	02-28-79	(NONE)
3 AND 4, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION	90189	02-21-79	(NONE)
N AREA, COAL LEASING APPLICATION	90208	02-27-79	(NONE)
MANAGEMENT, HERBICIDES, OREGON FORESTS	90144	02-06-79	(NONE)
ALE 58, WESTERN AND CENTRAL GULF	90201	02-23-79	(NONE)
BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	90203	02-26-79	(NONE)
K MINE, MINING/RECLAMATION, PERMIT	90218	02-28-79	(NONE)
TIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN	90125	02-01-79	(NONE)
TERNATIONAL AIRPORT, PALMDALE	90149	02-08-79	(NONE)
SS OF MARYVILLE, TN-115/TN-95 TO TN-73	90137	02-02-79	(NONE)
ERS BYPASS TO US 19/NC-28 INTERSECTION	90140	02-05-79	(NONE)
IS BYPASS, CORVALLIS	90146	02-06-79	(NONE)
ORD TO SPIRIT LAKE, CONSTRUCTION	90147	02-06-79	(NONE)
T CORRIDOR, IN-37 TO IN-45/46 BYPASS	90179	02-16-79	(NONE)
SA BY-PASS, RELOCATION	90196	02-23-79	(NONE)
LOTTE BYPASS, NC-273 TO US 29/NC-49	90204	02-26-79	(NONE)
Y ROAD, CA-168 TO D. VALLEY NAT'L MON.	81243	02-26-79	(NONE)
ARRY TO QUINCY	90151	02-09-79	(NONE)
LE AIRPORT CONNECTON TO I-95	90152	02-09-79	(NONE)
ERLOO TO CEDAR FALLS	90167	02-12-79	(NONE)

COUNCIL ON ENVIRO

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX - BY

AGENCY BUREAU	STATUS	STATE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	FINAL	GREENVILLE RAILROA MI-29, RECONSTRUCT ELKADER BYPASS, IO
	SUPPLEMP	PRIMARY HIGHWAY EX
U.S.COAST GUARD	DRAFT	TANKER SAFETY AND
	SUPPLEMSEADOCK APPLICATIO	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY EPA, REGION 10	DRAFT	CO INED SEWER OVE
	FINAL	SEWAGE SLUDGE DISP
EPA, REGION 3	DRAFT	WWT FACILITIES, HA
EPA, REGION 4	FINAL	CENTRAL FLORIDA PH
EPA, REGION 6	DRAFT	FAYETTE POWER PROJ
		VISTRON PETROCHEMI
	FINAL	LAKEVIEW WASTEWATE
EPA, REGION 7	FINAL	PROPOSED EXPANSION
EPA, REGION 8	FINAL	JACKSON WASTEWATER
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	DRAFT	TUCSON FM BROADCAS
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	FINAL	GREEN LAKE PROJEC
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION	SUPPLEMWASHINGTON D.C. C	

VIRONMENTAL QUALITY

- BY AGENCY, BUREAU, & STATUS

TATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
LROAD DEMONSTRATION, US 69 CROSSING	90170	02-13-79	(NONE)
RUCTION, ALGONAC	90190	02-[illegible]-79	(NONE)
, IOWA 13	90210	02-27-79	(NONE)
Y EXTENSION, I-95 TO WILMINGTON	90214	02-28-79	(NONE)
AND POLLUTION PREVENTION	90155	02-[illegible]-79	(NONE)
ATION AMENDMENT, TDPA, LICENSE	90198	02-23-79	(NONE)
OVERFLOW ABATEMENT PROJECT, SPOKANE	90185	02-20-79	(NONE)
DISPOSAL, PORTLAND	90188	02-21-79	(NONE)
, HANOVER CO, PHASE II AREA, GRANT	90213	02-28-79	(NONE)
A PHOSPHATE INDUSTRY	90194	02-23-79	(NONE)
PROJECT, NPDES PERMIT	90132	02-02-79	(NONE)
HEMICAL COMPLEX, NPDES PERMIT	90219	02-28-79	(NONE)
WATER TREATMENT FACILITIES, GRANT	90211	02-27-79	(NONE)
SION OF EXISTING WWT FACILITIES	90136	02-02-79	(NONE)
ATER TREATMENT SYSTEM	90168	02-12-79	(NONE)
DCASTING CORPORATION, PERMIT	90202	02-23-79	(NONE)
JECT NO, 2818, SITKA	90145	02-06-79	(NONE)
, CIVIC CENTER, SITE LOCATION	90131	02-02-79	(NONE)

COUNCIL ON E

STATEMENT TITLE INDEX

AGENCY / BUREAU	STATUS	
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	DRAFT	SHOOTERING CA
	FINAL	GREENE COUNTY
	SUPPLEM	PILGRIM NUCLE
STATE DEPARTMENT	FINAL	INCINERATION
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	FINAL	CORDOVA-UNION
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS	DRAFT	GROVE ISLE (F
		OHIO RIVER NA
		MIDDLE RIO GR
		ICE HARBOR LO
		LYNNHAVEN INL
		MERCED COUNTY
	FINAL	WESTON GENERA
		ARKABUTLA, EN
		LOCKS AND DAM
		PANAMA CITY B
		GULF INTRACOA
		PLACING OF SO
		CAYUGA STATIO
		PILLAR POINT
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	DRAFT	VA REPLACEMEN
		JOHN L. MCCLE
	FINAL	VA MEDICAL CE

STATEMENT TITLE	ACCESSION NUMBER	DATE FILED	NTIS ORDER NUMBER
CANYON URANIUM PROJECT, OPERATION	90156	02-09-79	(NONE)
NTY NUCLEAR POWERPLANT	90187	02-21-79	(NONE)
CLEAR STATION, UNIT 2, ALTERNATIVE SITES	90184	02-16-79	(NONE)
ON OF WASTES AT SEA, OCEAN DUMPING	90173	02-14-79	(NONE)
ION-BROWNS FERRY, TRANSMISSION LINE	90154	02-09-79	(NONE)
(FAIR ISLE) MARINA, MIAMI, PERMIT	90135	02-02-79	(NONE)
NAVIGATION PROJECT, O/M	90148	02-06-79	(NONE)
GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION	90165	02-12-79	(NONE)
LOCK AND DAM, O&M, SNAKE RIVER	90166	02-12-79	(NONE)
INLET, BAY & CONNECTING WATERS, DREDGING	90178	02-15-79	(NONE)
NTY STREAMS, FLOOD CONTROL	90199	02-23-79	(NONE)
ERATING UNIT 3, WAUSAU, PERMIT	90127	02-01-79	(NONE)
ENID, GRENADA, AND SARDIS LAKES, O/M	90141	02-05-79	(NONE)
DAM NO. 1, REHABILITATION, ST. PAUL	90158	02-09-79	(NONE)
Y BEACHS, EROSION, HURRICANE PROTECTION	90169	02-12-79	(NONE)
COASTAL WATERWAY, CHOCOLATE BAYOU	90177	02-15-79	(NONE)
SOLID FILL, DELAWARE RIVER, PERMIT	90182	02-16-79	(NONE)
TION, PERMIT, SOMERSET	90183	02-16-79	(NONE)
NT MARINA, REGULATORY PERMIT	90212	02-27-79	(NONE)
MENT MEDICAL CENTER, BALTIMORE	90192	02-22-79	(NONE)
CLELLAN MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL	90193	02-22-79	(NONE)
CENTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	90171	02-13-79	(NONE)

102 STATEMENT SUMMARY

AGENCY	DRAFT 102'S (NO FINAL)	FINAL 102'S	SUPPLEMENTS	TOTAL
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD	0	1	0	1
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	6	9	0	15
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	1	2	0	3
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AIR FORCE	1	0	1	2
DEPARTMENT OF HUD	6	7	0	13
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR	3	4	0	7
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	9	7	2	18
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	4	5	0	9
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	1	0	0	1
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	0	1	0	1
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION	0	0	1	1
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	1	1	1	3
STATE DEPARTMENT	0	1	0	1
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	0	1	0	1
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS	6	8	0	14
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	2	1	0	3
TOTALS	40	48	5	93

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONTACT: MR. HARRY FLAMM
COORDINATOR
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACTIVITIES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ROOM 412A
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-3965

DRAFT — DATE

ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL USES OF NATURAL GAS — 02/26

REGULATORY
PROPOSED IS THE DETERMINATION OF ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL USES OF NATURAL GAS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE UNDER SECTION 401(C) OF THE NATURAL GAS POLICY ACT OF 1978 (NGPA). THIS DECISION WILL DETERMINE EXACTLY WHICH USERS OF NATURAL GAS WILL BE ALLOWED PRIORITY USE UNDER THE NGPA AFTER APPLICATION FOR SUCH AUTHORITY. FIVE SECTORS WHICH INCLUDE: FOOD PROCESSING, FERTILIZERS, GLASS CONTAINERS, IRRIGATION, AND CROP DRYING, ACCOUNT FOR 95% OF THE INTERSTATE GAS CONSUMED IN ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL USES.
(EIS ORDER # 90206)

FOREST SERVICE

DRAFT — DATE

WESTERN SPRUCE BUDWORM, KAIBAB NF, GRAND CANYON NP — 02/09

ARIZONA
COUNTY: COCONINO
PROPOSED ARE FOUR ALTERNATIVES REGARDING A WESTERN SPRUCE EPIDEMIC ON 100,000 ACRES OF THE KAIBAB NATIONAL FOREST AND THE GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK, COCONINA COUNTY, ARIZONA. THE ALTERNATIVES INCLUDE: 1) NO ACTION, 2) SILVICULTURAL CONTROL TO CHANGE THE FOREST ENVIRONMENT ON NATIONAL FOREST LANDS, 4) INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT WITH USE OF PESTICIDE ON ALL LANDS, AND 5) PARTIAL TREATMENT OF CAMPGROUNDS, RECREATIONAL AREAS, HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE TIMBER SITES, ON NATIONAL FOREST LANDS ONLY.
(DES-03-07-79-1)
(EIS ORDER - 90159)

LOWER SALT RIVER RECREATION AREA, TONTO NF — 02/23

ARIZONA
COUNTY: MARICOPA
PROPOSED IS A MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE LOWER SALT RIVER RECREATION AREA IN THE TONTO NATIONAL FOREST, MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA. THE MAJOR ISSUES ADDRESSED CONCERN: 1) HIGH VOLUME RECREATIONAL USE, 2) USE CONFLICTS, 3) USER GROUP IDENTITY AND ACTIVITY PREFERENCE, 3) PUBLIC SAFETY,

4) ENDANGERED WILDLIFE, 5) FLOODPLAIN/WETLAND DEVELOPMENT, AND 6) VEHICULAR CONGESTION. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE INCLUDES, INPART: 1) PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION; 2) LIVESTOCK CONTROL; 3) EROSION CONTROL, RIVER STABILIZATION, AND VEGETATIVE REHABILITATION PROJECTS, AND; 4) A FEDERAL BOTANICAL AREA.
(DES-83-'8-02)
(EIS ORDER # 90195)

DRAFT

ENCAMPMENT RIVER WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY 02/02

COLORADO
COUNTY: JACKSON
PROPOSED IS THE INCLUSION IN THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER, THE COLORADO PORTION OF THE ENCAMPMENT RIVER ALONG WITH 6,240 ACRES OF ADJACENT LANDS IN ROUTT NATIONAL FOREST, JACKSON COUNTY, COLORADO. THE STATEMENT ALSO DISCUSSES RARE II, THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MT. ZIRKEL WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT PLAN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FOREST LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE MEDICINE BOW NATIONAL FOREST. FOUR ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(DES-02-11-79-01-LEG)
(EIS ORDER # 90134)

WALLOWA-WHITMAN NF TEN-YEAR TIMBER RESOURCE PLAN 02/05

OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A REVISED TEN-YEAR TIMBER RESOURCE PLAN FOR THE WALLOWA-WHITMAN NATIONAL FOREST IN THE COUNTIES OF BAKER, GRANT, MALHEUR, UMATILLA, AND UNION, OREGON. FOUR ALTERNATIVES ARE DESCRIBED FOR MANAGEMENT OF TIMBER RESOURCES ON 1,141,406 ACRES CLASSIFIED AS COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND AVAILABLE FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION BY THE LAND MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) NO CHANGE, 2) EXTENSIVE MANAGEMENT, 3) INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT, AND 4) INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT/DECLINING FLOW.
(DES-05-16-79-03)
(EIS ORDER # 90143)

FINAL DATE

SNOW BOWL SKI AREA PROPOSAL, COCONINO NF 02/28

ARIZONA
COUNTY: COCONINO
THIS PROPOSAL DESCRIBES SIX ALTERNATIVES FOR THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SNOW BOWL SKI AREA LOCATED IN THE COCONINO NATIONAL FOREST, COCONINO COUNTY, ARIZONA. THE STATEMENT ALSO DISCUSSES AN ACCESS ROAD TO THE SNOW BOWL, WHICH MUST COORDINATE WITH THE PLAN FOR THE SKI AREA. THE SNOW BOWL IS A 777-ACRE PERMITTED SKI AREA WHICH WAS DISCUSSED IN THE FINAL EIS, SAN FRANCISCO PEAKS LAND USE PLAN FILED IN DECEMBER 1972, WHICH EMPHASIZED WINTER SPORTS

AS THE MAJOR USE.
(USDA-FS-03-04-78-01)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA EPA DOI AHP
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90215)

FINAL
RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS 02/02

IDAHO
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE DESIGNATION OF 1,889,288 ACRES OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS AS PART OF THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM. THE DESIGNATION AREA IS LOCATED IN BOISE, CHALLIS, PAYETTE, SALMON, BITTERROOT, AND NEZPERCE NATIONAL FORESTS IN THE COUNTIES OF CUSTER, IDAHO, LEMHI, AND VALLEY, IDAHO STATE AND INCLUDES PARTS OF THE IDAHO PRIMITIVE AREA AND SALMON RIVER BREAKS PRIMITIVE AREA. THE PLAN ALSO RECOMMENDS: 1) THE AREA BE NAMED THE RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS, AND 2) PRIMITIVE AREA STATUS BE RESCINDED FROM 31,722 ACRES. THE USDA FILED A DRAFT AND FINAL EIS ON THE PROJECT TITLED SALMON RIVER AND IDAHO WILDERNESS AREA. THIS FEIS REPLACES THE PRIOR FINAL, #41823, FILED 12-4-74.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI DOC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90133)

STAR PLANNING UNIT, KOOTENAI NF 02/28

IDAHO
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THIS ACTION INVOLVES THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A REVISED LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE STAR PLANNING UNIT, TROY DISTRICT, KOOTENAI NATIONAL FOREST, LOCATED IN LINCOLN, MONTANA, BONNER, AND BOUNDARY COUNTIES, IDAHO. THE PROPOSAL AFFECTS APPROXIMATELY 27,274 ACRES OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS THAT HAVE BEEN STRATIFIED INTO NINE MANAGEMENT UNITS WITH SIMILAR RESOURCE SITUATIONS. THIS PLAN RECOGNIZES THE RECREATION POTENTIAL ALONG THE KOOTENAI RIVER, TANGIBLE RESOURCES SUCH AS WOOD FIBER AND INTANGIBLE RESOURCES SUCH AS ESTHETICS.

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90220)

OCHOCO-CROOKED RIVER PLANNING UNIT, OCHOCO NF 02/12

OREGON
COUNTY: CROOK WHEELER GRANT
PROPOSED IS A LAND MANAGEMENT DIRECTION FOR 544,060 ACRES OF THE OCHOCO NATIONAL FOREST LOCATED IN CROOK, WHEELER AND GRANT COUNTIES, OREGON. TEN LAND MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

ARE CONSIDERED WHICH INCLUDE EMPHASIS ON: 1) RECREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF LARGE BLOCKS OF LAND IN A NATURAL CONDITION; 2) USE OF LAND FOR COMMODITY PRODUCTION AND BIG GAME HABITAT NEEDS; 3) MANAGEMENT THAT DOES NOT FAVOR ANY SINGLE USE OF THE LAND; AND, 4) USE OF LAND FOR COMMODITY PRODUCTION. THE PREFERRED LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN PROVIDES FOR A BALANCE OF ALL FORMS OF CURRENT AND PROJECTED USES WITHIN THE PLANNING UNIT.
(USDA-FS-R6-FES-(ADM)-78-7)
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOE OEO NRC HUD HEW DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90164)

FINAL

SIUSLAW NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN 02/15

OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THE PROPOSED ACTION IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TEN-YEAR PLAN FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SIUSLAW NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER RESOURCE. THE FOREST IS LOCATED IN PORTIONS OF BENTON, COOS, DOUGLAS, LANE, LINCOLN, POLK, TILLAMOOK, AND YAMHILL COUNTIES, OREGON. THERE ARE 557,250 ACRES OF REGULATED COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND. UNDER THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE, 264,480 ACRES WILL BE MANAGED AS A STANDARD COMPONENT; 259,867 ACRES AS A SPECIAL COMPONENT; 32,903 ACRES AS A MARGINAL COMPONENT; AND IN ADDITION THERE ARE 12,436 ACRES WHICH ARE UNREGULATED COMMERCIAL FOREST LAND.
(USDA-FS-R6-FES(ADM)78-11)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI DOE USDA DOC EPA
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90175)

FREMONT NATIONAL FOREST, TIMBER MANAGEMENT PLAN 02/26

OREGON
COUNTY: LAKE KLAMATH
PROPOSED IS A TEN YEAR MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE FREMONT NATIONAL FOREST IN LAKE AND KLAMATH COUNTIES, OREGON. THE INITIAL ANNUAL PROGRAM LEVEL PROPOSES TO HARVEST 66.50 MILLION BOARD FEET. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER: 1) INTENSIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT, 2) NONINTENSIVE PLAN WITH NO CHANGE IN ANNUAL ALLOWABLE CUT, 3) LOW INVESTMENT, AND 4) INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT WITH DEVIATION FROM EVENFLOW.
(USDA-FS-R-6-FES-(ADM)-78-4)

COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOI OEO HUD
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90207)

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

FINAL DATE

115KV TRANSMISSION LINE, LAKE CITY TO CREEDE 02/12

COLORADO
COUNTY: HINSDALE CHAFFEE ALAMOSA
PROPOSED IS FUTURE INSTALLATION OF APPROXIMATELY 44 MILES OF 115KV TRANSMISSION LINE TO DELIVER ADDITIONAL POWER AND ENERGY FROM LAKE CITY, HINSDALE COUNTY, TO SAN LUIS VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MONTE VISTA, COLORADO. DUE TO THE PRESENT CRITICAL DEMANDS AT CREEDE AND ELSEWHERE IN THE SAN LUIS VALLEY IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE ORIGINAL FINANCING BE APPLIED TOWARDS AN ALTERNATE PROPOSAL WHILE THE LAKE CITY TO CREEDE LINE IS BEING STUDIED. THIS STATEMENT DISCUSSES THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL AND ALTERNATIVES.
(USDA-REA-EIS-(ADM)-78-8-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI USDA EPA COE
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90163)

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

DRAFT DATE

UPPER TAMPA BAY WATERSHED 02/12

FLORIDA
COUNTY: HILLSBOROUGH PINELLAS PASCO
PROPOSED IS A PROJECT FOR WATERSHED PROTECTION, FLOOD PREVENTION, AND AGRICULTURAL WATER MANAGEMENT (DRAINAGE) IN HILLSBOROUGH, PINELLAS, AND PASCO COUNTIES, FLORIDA. PLANNED CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION WILL CONSIST OF: 1) ENLARGING OR REALIGNING 13.7 MILES OF EXISTING CHANNEL, 2) 4.4 MILES OF NEW CHANNEL, AND 3) 12.2 MILES OF CLEARING AND DESNAGGING. TWELVE GRADE STABILIZATION STRUCTURES, 3 LAKE LEVEL CONTROL STRUCTURES, 134 PIPE DROP SPILLWAYS, AND 8,000 FEET OF EARTHEN DIKING WILL BE INSTALLED TO STABILIZE WATER FLOW, MANIPULATE WATER LEVELS, AND TO STORE AND REMOVE FLOODWATERS. LAND TREATMENT MEASURES ARE ALSO INCLUDED.
(USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-78-1-(D)-FL)
(EIS ORDER # 90162)

FINAL DATE

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED 02/12

ILLINOIS
COUNTY: COOK WILL
THE PROPOSAL INVOLVES THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED WHICH COVERS 136,500 ACRES IN SOUTHERN COOK AND NORTHEASTERN WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS. THIS WATERSHED PLAN HAS BEEN DE-

VELOPED TO: 1) PROVIDE WATERSHED PROTECTION THROUGH AN ACCELERATED LAND TREATMENT PROGRAM; 2) REDUCE FLOOD DAMAGES BY IMPLEMENTING A) FLOODWATER RETARDING STRUCTURES, B) CHANNEL WORK, C) STREAM CHANNEL MAINTENANCE; AND 3) PROVIDE INCREASED WATER BASED RECREATION. PLANNED STRUCTURAL MEASURES CONSIST OF THREE SINGLE PURPOSE EXCAVATED FLOODWATER RETARDING STRUCTURES AND CHANNEL WORK ON 1.99 MILES OF PREVIOUSLY MODIFIED STREAM.
(USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-78-1-F-IL)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USA DOI HEW HUD EPA USDA DOE GLBC
(EIS ORDER # 90161)

BRUSH CREEK WATERSHED 02/09

WEST VIRGINIA
COUNTY: MERCER
THIS ACTION INVOLVES A PROJECT FOR WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION IN MERCER COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE IMPLEMENTED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT AND AUTHORIZED FOR INSTALLATION JUNE 21, 1960. PLANNED PROJECT MEASURES CONSIST OF INSTALLING CONSERVATION LAND TREATMENT MEASURES ON ABOUT 4,330 ACRES, SIX FLOOD WATER RETARDING STRUCTURES, FOUR MULTIPLE PURPOSE STRUCTURES, RECREATION FACILITIES, 1.44 MILES OF CHANNEL WORK ON GLADY FORK, AND 5.85 MILES OF CHANNEL WORK ON BRUSH CREEK. SINCE THE PROJECT AUTHORIZATION, ABOUT 80 PERCENT OF THE WORK HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
(USDA-SCS-EIS-WS-(ADM)-78-3-(F)-WV)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE DOI EPA USDA ORRC
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90157)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

CONTACT: MR. STEVE ROTHENBURG
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
1825 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20428
(202) 673-5205

FINAL DATE

OAKLAND AIR SERVICE CASE, DOCKET 30699 02/02

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE GRANTING OF OPERATING AUTHORITY TO QUALIFIED APPLICANTS TO IMPROVE AIR SERVICE TO THE OAKLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND OTHER AIRPORTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA OF CALIFORNIA. THE NINE COUNTY BAY AREA WILL BE SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED ACTION. THROUGH THE OAKLAND SERVICE CASE, THE BOARD HAS TENTATIVELY DECIDED TO ADOPT A POLICY OF AWARDING PERMISSIVE, SUBSIDY-INELIGIBLE AUTHORITY IN EACH MARKET WHERE A NEED FOR NEW AUTHORITY IS SHOWN TO EVERY FIT, WILLING AND ABLE APPLICANT WHOSE ILLUSTRATIVE SERVICE PROPOSAL INDICATES THAT IT IS PREPARED TO SATISFY ANY PART OF THAT NEED.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA COE
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90130)

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

CONTACT: DR. C. GRANT ASH
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
ATTN: DAEN-CWR-P
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1000 INDEPENDENCE AVENUE, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314
(202) 693-6795

DRAFT DATE

MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, FLOOD CONTROL 02/23

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: MERCED
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FLOOD CONTROL DAMS ON CANAL AND BLACK RASCAL CREEKS, ENLARGEMENT OF EXISTING DETENTION DAMS ON BEAR AND BURNS CREEKS, AND CONSTRUCTION AND MODIFICATION OF LEVEES AND CHANNELS ALONG APPROXIMATELY 29.5 MILES OF FAHRENS, BLACK RASCAL, AND BEAR CREEKS, ALL WITHIN MERCED COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. ALL RESERVOIRS WOULD BE USED FOR FLOOD CONTROL PURPOSES ONLY AND WOULD NOT MAINTAIN A MINIMUM POOL.
(SACRAMENTO DISTRICT)
(FIS ORDER # 90199)

GROVE ISLE (FAIR ISLE) MARINA, MIAMI, PERMIT 02/02

FLORIDA
COUNTY: DADE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FIXED-PIER MARINA/APPURTENANT FACILITIES WITH A DOCKING CAPACITY OF ABOUT 98 BOATS ON GROVE ISLE (FORMERLY FAIR ISLE), DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA. CONSTRUCTION WILL CONSIST OF THREE CONCRETE FIXED PIERS EXTENDING A MAXIMUM OF 250 FEET INTO BISCAYNE BAY, AND ANOTHER EXTENDING 150 FEET INTO THE BAY. ABOUT 44 FINGER PIERS WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED AS SLIPS FOR THE FIVE PIERS.
(JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT)
(FIS ORDER # 90135)

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE VALLEY FLOOD PROTECTION 02/12

NEW MEXICO
COUNTY: BERNALILLO VALENCIA SANDOVAL
PROPOSED IS A FLOOD PROTECTION PLAN FOR AREAS OF THE RIO GRANDE VALLEY EXTENDING FROM THE VICINITY OF BELEN IN THE COUNTIES OF BERNALILLO, VALENCIA, AND SANDOVAL, NEW MEXICO. THE PLAN WOULD BE ACHIEVED LARGELY BY REHABILITATING AND/OR RAISING THE EXISTING LEVEE SYSTEM AND INSTALLING ADDITIONAL BANK PROTECTION WORKS. MITIGATIVE AND COMPENSATORY MEASURES ARE ALSO INCLUDED.
(ALBUQUERQUE DISTRICT)
(FIS ORDER # 90165)

DRAFT DATE

OHIO RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, O/M 02/06

SEVERAL
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE CONTINUANCE OF THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF TWENTY LOCKS AND DAMS OF THE EXISTING OHIO RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT IN THE STATES OF PENNSYLVANIA, WEST VIRGINIA, OHIO, KENTUCKY, INDIANA, AND ILLINOIS. MAINTENANCE INCLUDES THE REMOVAL OF BARRIERS TO NAVIGATION, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF VARIOUS CHANNEL REGULATING STRUCTURES, AND PERIODIC DREDGING, CONFINED LARGELY TO THE APPROACH CHANNELS OF THE LOCKS AND THE MOUTHS OF TRIBUTARY STREAMS. DREDGE SPOIL WILL CONTINUE TO BE DISPOSED OF IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING REGULATIONS, EITHER ON LAND OR IN OPEN WATER.
(OHIO RIVER DIVISION)
(EIS ORDER # 90148)

LYNNHAVEN INLET, BAY & CONNECTING WATERS, DREDGING 02/15

VIRGINIA
COUNTY: CHESAPEAKE
PROPOSED IS MAINTENANCE DREDGING OF LYNNHAVEN INLET AND BAY TO AUTHORIZED DIMENSIONS WHICH WILL REQUIRE THE REMOVAL OF APPROXIMATELY 100,000 CUBIC YARDS AT 2-3 YEAR INTERVALS. DISPOSAL WILL BE ON A 6-ACRE PORTION OF A 17 ACRE SITE WHICH THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINA IS ATTEMPTING TO ACQUIRE. THE AREA IS DESIGNED FOR USE AS A PERMANENT DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREA IN CONJUNCTION WITH A STATE OPERATED BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY. THE MATERIAL PLACED AT THE DISPOSAL SITE WILL BE TRANSPORTED BY TRUCK TO THE OCEAN FRONT, VIRGINIA BEACH FOR THE PURPOSES OF SAND REPLENISHING.
(NORFOLK DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90178)

ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, O&M, SNAKE RIVER 02/12

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: FRANKLIN WALLA WALLA
PROPOSED IS THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM ON THE SNAKE RIVER, FRANKLIN AND WALLA WALLA COUNTIES, WASHINGTON. THE PROJECT IS ESSENTIALLY COMPLETED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOME CONTINUED RECREATION DEVELOPMENT AND PROVISION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION. THE PROJECT INCLUDES A NAVIGATION LOCK, A SIX TURBINE GENERATOR UNIT HYDROELECTRIC SPILLWAY DAM, AND LAKE WITH ASSOCIATED RECREATION FACILITIES. PROJECT OPERATION IS TIED TO THE SYSTEM OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST.
(WALLA WALLA DISTRICT)
(EIS ORDER # 90166)

FINAL

PILLAR PO NT MARINA, REGULATORY PERMIT 02/27

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: SAN MATEO
THE SAN MATEO COUNTY HARBOR DISTRICT, EL GRANADA, CALIFORNIA HAS APPLIED FOR A PERMIT TO DEVELOP A MARINA AT THE NORTH END OF HALF MOON BAY NEAR THE COMMUNITIES OF EL GRANADA AND PRINCETON WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE EXISTING BREAKWATERS BUILT IN 1961. THE PROJECT SITE IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 20 MILES SOUTH OF SAN FRANCISCO. THE PROJECT WILL INCLUDE THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RUBBLE-MOUND BREAKWATERS INSIDE THE EX.STING BREAKWATERS, ENCLOSING APPROXIMATELY 42 ACRES OF WATER AREA. THE NEW BREAKWATERS WOULD HAVE A PERIPHERAL LENGTH OF APPROXIMATELY 5,290 FEET, PROVIDING WAVE AND SURGE PROTECTION WITHIN THE BOAT BASINS.
(SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90212)

PANAMA CITY BEACHS, EROSION, HURRICANE PROTECTION 02/12

FLORIDA
COUNTY: BAY
THE PROPOSED PROJECT FOR BEACH EROSION CONTROL AND HURRICANE PROTECTION FOR THE PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FLORIDA, WOULD INCLUDE 18.5 MILES OF BEACH RESTORATION PLUS AN ARTIFICIAL DUNE AND BERM BETWEEN PHILIPS INLET AND THE ENTRANCE CHANNEL INTO PANAMA CITY HARBOR. THE WORK WOULD INVOLVE DREDGING OFFSHORE AT THE 10-FATHOM CONTOUR, WHICH VARIES BETWEEN ONE-HALF TO ONE MILE OFFSHORE. THERE WOULD BE AN INITIAL NEED FOR 7,865,000 CUBIC YARDS OF SAND TO CONSTRUCT THE ENTIRE 18.5-MILE PROJECT. RENOURISHMENT OF THE BEACH WOULD REQUIRE 946,000 CUBIC YARDS OF SAND AT 10-YEAR INTERVALS.
(MOBILE DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI DOC USDA USCG DOT HUD HEW
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90169)

LOCKS AND DAM NO. 1, REHABILITATION, ST. PAUL 02/09

MINNESOTA
COUNTY: RAMSEY HENNIPEN
PROPOSED IS THE REHABILITATION OF LOCKS AND DAM NO. 1 IN THE ST. PAUL-MINNEAPOLIS REACH OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT MILE 847.6 ABOVE THE MOUTH OF THE OHIO RIVER. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION CALLS FOR THE CLOSING AND DEWATERING OF THE TWO LOCKS FROM DECEMBER 1 TO MAY 1; REHABILITATION SHOULD NOT AFFECT THE NORMAL NAVIGATION SEASON. THE LOCK WALLS WOULD BE RESURFACED AND NEW MACHINERY AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT INSTALLED.
(ST. PAUL DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOE DOI USCG DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90158)

FINAL DATE

ARKABUTLA, ENID, GRENADA, AND SARDIS LAKES, O/M 02/05

MISSISSIPPI
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE CONTINUATION OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES AT ARKABUTLA, ENID, GRENADA AND SARDIS LAKES, MISSISSIPPI. THESE PROJECTS WERE AUTHORIZED FOR FLOOD CONTROL WITHIN THE YAZOO RIVER BASIN AND ARE DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE BASIN FROM OVERFLOW ABOVE THE HEAD OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BACKWATER AREA. ARKABUTLA LAKE IS LOCATED IN TATE AND DESOTO COUNTIES; ENID LAKE IS LOCATED IN YALOBUSHA, PANOLA AND LAFAYETTE COUNTIES; GRENADA LAKE IS LOCATED IN GRENADA, CALHOUN AND YALOBUSHA COUNTIES, AND; SARDIS LAKE IS LOCATED IN PANOLA, LAFAYETTE AND MARSHALL COUNTIES.
(VICKSBURG DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOE USDA DOC DOT EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 901411)

CAYUGA STATION, PERMIT, SOMERSET 02/16

NEW YORK
COUNTY: NIAGARA
THE PROPOSED ACTION IS A PERMIT APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A FOSSIL FUEL STEAM ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION AT SOMERSET, NEW YORK BY THE NEW YORK ELECTRIC AND GAS CORPORATION (NYSEG). THE PROPOSED GENERATING STATION WILL UTILIZE ONE LOW SULFUR COAL-FIRED UNIT TO PRODUCE STEAM FOR THE GENERATION OF 850 MEGAWATTS OF ELECTRICAL POWER. THE EXHAUST STEAM FROM THE TURBINE GENERATOR WILL BE COOLED AND CONDENSED BY USING LAKE ONTARIO WATER PUMPED TO THE PLANT VIA PIPELINE AND CIRCULATED THROUGH A ONCE THROUGH CIRCULATING WATER SYSTEM. THE ELECTRICAL POWER PRODUCED UNDER THIS PROPOSAL WILL BE TRANSMITTED VIA HIGH VOLTAGE ELECTRICAL TRANSMISSION LINES TO CONNECT WITH EXISTING ONES.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA AHP USDA DOE DOC HUD DOI GSA DOT USCG STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90183)

PLACING OF SOLID FILL, DELAWARE RIVER, PERMIT 02/16

PENNSYLVANIA
COUNTY: PHILADELPHIA
THE ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY HAS APPLIED FOR RENEWAL OF A U.S. ARMY PERMIT TO COMPLETE FILLING OPERATIONS. THIS ACTION ENTAILS DEPOSITION OF CONSTRUCTION RUBBLE BY END DUMPING FROM TRUCKS, IN THE DELAWARE RIVER, OFF BRIDGE STREET, IN FRONT OF THE PHILADELPHIA PLANT. THIS OPERA-

TION WAS ORIGINALLY APPROVED UNDER A U.S. ARMY PERMIT ISSUED ON 28 JANUARY 1971 AND APPROXIMATELY 6.5 ACRES OF THIS AREA HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. RENEWAL OF THE PERMIT IS REQUIRED TO CONTINUE THE PROJECT.
(PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT)

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC HUD DOI EPA USCG DRBC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 90182)

FINAL

GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHOCOLATE BAYOU 02/15

TEXAS
COUNTY: BRAZORIA
THE PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTION IS THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EXISTING CHOCOLATE BAYOU NAVIGATION CHANNEL PROJECT IN BRAZORIA COUNTY, TEXAS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A SALTWATER BARRIER IN THE BAYOU UPSTREAM OF LIVERPOOL, TEXAS. THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS CONSIST OF ENLARGEMENT AND ALL FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE EXISTING LOCALLY CONSTRUCTED SHALLOW-DRAFT CHANNEL IN CHOCOLATE BAY AND THE LOWER REACHES OF CHOCOLATE BAYOU FROM THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (GIWW) TO CHANNEL MILE 8.2 AND CONSTRUCTION OF A SALTWATER BARRIER IN CHOCOLATE BAYOU ABOUT 16.9 MILES ABOVE THE GIWW.
(GALVESTON DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI DOC DOE DOT USDA AHP
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90177)

WESTON GENERATING UNIT 3, WAUSAU, PERMIT 02/01

WISCONSIN
COUNTY: MARATHON
THE PROPOSED ACTION IS THE ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL PERMITS RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A 300 MW COAL-FIRED STEAM GENERATING UNIT AT THE WESTON GENERATING STATION LOCATED ON A 144-ACRE TRACT IN MARATHON COUNTY, WISCONSIN ABOUT 8 MILES SOUTH OF THE CITY OF WAUSAU IN A COMBINED AGRICULTURAL, RESIDENTIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL AREA. THE WESTON 3 GENERATING STATION IS PROPOSED TO MEET PROJECTED GROWTH IN ELECTRICAL DEMAND BEGINNING IN THE EARLY 1980'S. THE SIZE AND TYPE OF THE PROPOSED PLANT IS DETERMINED BY ANALYSIS WHICH CONSIDERS: 1) THE LEVEL OF SYSTEM RELIABILITY DESIRED; 2) THE COST OF CONSTRUCTING AND OPERATION. (ST. PAUL DISTRICT)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA USDA DOC HEW DOI USCG DOT
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90127)

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CONTACT: DR. SIDNEY R. GALLER
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-4335

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

FINAL — DATE

TANK VESSELS ENGAGED IN DOMESTIC TRADE — 02/16

NATIONAL
THE PROPOSAL OF THIS STATEMENT WOULD PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF TANK VESSELS IN THE GUARANTEE OF FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS (NOTES, BONDS, ETC.) INCLUDING INTEREST, THAT ARE OBTAINED IN THE PRIVATE MARKET BY US CITIZENS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SUCH VESSELS IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS UNDER TITLE XI FINANCING. THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM IS TO PROMOTE THE GROWTH AND MODERNIZATION OF THE US MERCHANT MARINE BY ENABLING PRIVATE OWNERS TO OBTAIN LONG-TERM FINANCING AS IS AVAILABLE TO THE LARGER, FINANCIALLY STRONGER CORPORATIONS.
(MA-EIS-7502-79-A1-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: DOE EPA DOI
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 901801)

NAT'L OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN.

DRAFT — DATE

VIRGIN ISLANDS COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM — 02/01

VIRGIN ISLANDS
PROPOSED IS A COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS. APPROVAL WOULD PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM, ALLOW PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION GRANTS TO BE AWARDED TO THE TERRITORY, AND REQUIRE THAT FEDERAL ACTIONS BE CONSISTENT WITH THE PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM ADDRESSES GENERAL AREAS OF PARTICULAR CONCERN AND SITE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS.
(EIS ORDER # 90129)

FINAL — DATE

STONE CRAB, FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN, GULF OF MEX. — 02/08

GULF OF MEXICO
PROPOSED IS A FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE STONE CRAB FISHERY IN THE GULF OF MEXICO CONSERVATION ZONE FROM THE

FLORIDA-ALABAMA LINE SOUTHWEST TO AND INCLUDING THE FLORIDA KEYS. THE BASIC OBJECTIVES OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN ARE: 1) ORDERLY CONDUCT OF THE FISHERY TO REDUCE CONFLICT BETWEEN OTHER FISHERIES IN THE AREA, 2) ESTABLISHMENT OF A FISHERY STATISTICAL REPORTING SYSTEM FOR MONITORING THE STONE CRAB FISHERY, 3) FULL UTILIZATION OF THE STONE CRAB RESOURCE IN THE MANAGEMENT AREA, AND 4) PROMOTE UNIFORMITY OF REGULATION THROUGHOUT THE MANAGEMENT AREA.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA MMC
BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 901133)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AIR FORCE

CONTACT: DR. CARLOS STERN
DEPUTY FOR ENVIRONMENT AND SAFETY
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
ROOM 4C885, PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20330
(202) 697-9297

DRAFT — DATE

FLIGHT OPERATIONS IN THE SELLS AIRSPACE — 02/09

ARIZONA
COUNTY: PIMA
THIS STATEMENT CONSIDERS, AS A CONTINUING ACTIVITY, THE IMPACTS OF CURRENT AND FUTURE AIRCREW TRAINING IN THE AIRSPACE OVER THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION IN PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS SELLS AIRSPACE. TRAINING IN THIS AIRSPACE IS CONDUCTED BY AIR FORCE AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD UNITS STATIONED AT LUKE AFB AND WILLIAMS AFB NEAR PHOENIX, ARIZONA AND AT DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB AND TUCSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT NEAR TUCSON, ARIZONA.
(EIS ORDER # 901501)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT — DATE

MX: MILESTONE II, AIR MOBILE ALTERNATIVE — 02/16

PROGRAMMATIC
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL FILED IN OCTOBER 1978 CONCERNING THE MX: MILESTONE II PROGRAM. THE SUPPLEMENT ANALYZES THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH AIR MOBILITY AS AN ALTERNATIVE SURVIVABLE BASING MODE FOR MX. THE ELEMENTS OF THE AIR MOBILE ALTERNATIVE AS NOW ENVISIONED CONSIST OF A TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT, A MISSILE SIMILAR TO THOSE ALREADY DESCRIBED IN THE FEIS AND A STRUCTURE OF AIR BASES. THIS ALTERNATIVE IS IN ADDITION TO THE BURIED TRENCH, VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL SHELTERS AND POOL ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED IN THE FEIS.
(EIS ORDER # 901811)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

EPA, REGION 10

DRAFT DATE

COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW ABATEMENT PROJECT, SPOKANE 02/20

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: SPOKANE
PROPOSED IS A COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW ABATEMENT PROJECT FOR THE CITY OF SPOKANE, SPOKANE COUNTY, WASHINGTON. AT PRESENT, THE INTERCEPTOR SYSTEM IN THE CITY IS UNABLE TO TRANSPORT ALL OF THE SEWAGE AND STORMWATERS TO THE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT. THE SYSTEM OVERFLOWS THE EXCESS INTO THE SPOKANE RIVER AT OVER 30 POINTS IN THE CITY. THREE MAJOR ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED. FOUR OTHER ALTERNATIVES, WHICH ARE COMBINATIONS OR MODIFICATIONS OF THE MAJOR THREE, ARE ALSO CONSIDERED.
(EPA 910/9-78-055)
(EIS ORDER # 901A5)

FINAL DATE

SEWAGE SLUDGE DISPOSAL, PORTLAND 02/21

OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THIS STATEMENT IDENTIFIES ALTERNATIVES FOR PROVIDING THE CITY OF PORTLAND WITH A MEANS OF SLUDGE DISPOSAL AND REUSE. IN ADDITION TO A NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE THREE OTHERS ARE BEING CONSIDERED FOR THE PROJECT AREA LOCATED IN SEVERAL COUNTIES IN OREGON. THE ALTERNATIVES BEING CONSIDERED ARE: A) CONVEYANCE OF LIQUID SLUDGE TO MORROW COUNTY WITH STORAGE IN LAGOONS PRIOR TO LAND APPLICATION; B) SLUDGE DRYING AND LOCAL USE AS LANDFILL OR SOIL AMENDMENT CONDITIONER; AND C) CONVEYANCE OF LIQUID SLUDGE TO THE CLACKAMAS-MARION COUNTY AREA FOR LAGOON STORAGE PRIOR TO LAND APPLICATION.
(EPA 910/9-78-050)
COMMENTS MADE BY: HUD COE DOI USDA AHP
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 901AA)

EPA, REGION 3

DRAFT DATE

WWT FACILITIES, HANOVER CO, PHASE II AREA, GRANT 02/28

VIRGINIA
COUNTY: HANOVER
PROPOSED IS A WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES PLAN FOR HANOVER COUNTY, PHASE II AREA, VIRGINIA. THE AREA HAS BEEN

DIVIDED INTO SEVEN SERVICE AREA PLANNING UNITS (SAPU'S). THE ALTERNATIVES FOLLOW THREE SCENARIOS: 1) LIMITED BUILD (LOCAL), 2) SUBREGIONAL, AND 3) REGIONAL (AREAWIDE) SOLUTIONS. LAND TREATMENT POTENTIAL IS INCORPORATED INTO ALL ALTERNATIVES. THE ALTERNATIVES ARE GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE SAPU'S SERVED AS FOLLOWS: LIMITED BUILD WILL UPGRADE EXISTING SYSTEMS, SUBREGIONAL WILL INVOLVE COMBINATIONS OF SAPU'S WITH A SEPARATE SYSTEM FOR EACH SUBREGION, AND REGIONAL WHICH WILL INVOLVE SERVICE TO THE ENTIRE PHASE II AREA.
(EIS ORDER # 90213)

EPA, REGION 4

FINAL — DATE

CENTRAL FLORIDA PHOSPHATE INDUSTRY — 02/23

FLORIDA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THE CENTRAL FLORIDA PHOSPHATE DISTRICT ENCOMPASSES AN AREA OF APPROXIMATELY 2000 SQUARE MILES IN POLK, HILLSBOROUGH, MANATEE, HARDEE AND DESOTO COUNTIES, FLORIDA. THERE ARE CURRENTLY SEVENTEEN POTENTIAL NEW SOURCE MINES IN THE DISTRICT. ISSUANCE OF NEW SOURCE NPDES PERMITS TO EACH OF THESE MINES WILL PROBABLY BE DETERMINED A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION WHICH WILL BE SUBJECT TO NEPA REVIEW. THIS EIS IS TO ASSESS AREAWIDE AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ON THE ENTIRE AREA INVOLVED AND PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR DEVELOPING SITE SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.
(EPA 904/9-78-026A)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI HEW USAF COE USDA EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90194)

EPA, REGION 6

DRAFT — DATE

FAYETTE POWER PROJECT, NPDES PERMIT — 02/02

TEXAS
COUNTY: FAYETTE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A NPDES PERMIT FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FROM THE FAYETTE POWER PROJECT INTO CEDAR CREEK IN THE COUNTY OF FAYETTE, TEXAS. THE APPLICANT HAS INITIATED CONSTRUCTION ON A COAL-FIRED STEAM ELECTRIC STATION ON A SITE LOCATED SEVEN MILES FROM LA GRANGE. SOME FEATURES OF THE PROJECT INCLUDE: 1) TWO 600 MWE FOSSIL-FUELED STEAM ELECTRIC GENERATING UNITS, 2) ASSOCIATED COAL HANDLING AND STORAGE AREAS, AND 3) 121 MILES OF NEW OR WIDENED TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR.
(EIS ORDER # 90132)

DRAFT DATE

VISTRON PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX, NPDES PERMIT 02/28

TEXAS
COUNTY: CALHOUN
PROPOSED IS A NPDES PERMIT FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGE FROM THE VISTRON PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX INTO THE VICTORIA BARGE CANAL, CALHOUN COUNTY, TEXAS. THE COMPLEX WILL BE LOCATED ON A 2,300 ACRE SITE AND WILL CONSIST OF A BARGE DOCK, UTILITY SYSTEM, AND STORAGE TANKS; AT FULL OPERATION 90,000 BARRELS OF HIGH-SULFUR CRUDE OIL AND 25 MILLION STANDARD CUBIC FEET OF NATURAL GAS WILL BE REQUIRED DAILY. THREE ALTERNATIVES ARE INCLUDED.
(EIS ORDER # 90219)

FINAL DATE

LAKEVIEW WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES, GRANT 02/27

ARKANSAS
COUNTY: BAXTER
THIS PROPOSAL CONSIDERS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WASTEWATER TREATMENT (WWT) PLANT LOCATED IN LAKEVIEW, BAXTER COUNTY, ARKANSAS, WHICH IS DESIGNED TO SERVE 3,000 PERSONS AT 100 GALLONS/DAY FOR AN AVERAGE WASTEWATER FLOW OF 300,000 GPD IN THE 1995 DESIGN YEAR. THE COLLECTION SYSTEM WILL SERVE THE TOWNS OF LAKEVIEW, EDGEWOOD BAY, LEISURE HILLS, BULL SHOALS STATE PARK, LAKEVIEW RECREATION AREA AND THE GASTON ROAD AREA. SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED INCLUDING NO-ACTION; UPGRADING ON-SITE DISPOSAL SYSTEM; CONSTRUCTION OF A MUNICIPAL COLLECTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM; AND PARTICIPATION TO A REGIONAL SYSTEM.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP USDA DOC HEW DOI COE FEA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90211)

EPA, REGION 7

FINAL DATE

PROPOSED EXPANSION OF EXISTING WWT FACILITIES 02/07

NEBRASKA
COUNTY: SCOTTS BLUFF
THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS THE GRANTING OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS OF PUBLICLY OWNED SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS IN SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY, NEBRASKA. THE MUNICIPALITIES WHICH OWN AND OPERATE THESE FACILITIES ARE GERING, SCOTTSBLUFF, AND TERRYTOWN, NEBRASKA. TOGETHER THESE MUNICIPALITIES CONSTITUTE THE MAJOR TRADE AND MANUFACTURING CENTER IN THE NEBRASKA PANHANDLE. THIS EIS WAS PREPARED TO EVALUATE THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF THESE PROPOSED ACTIONS

UPON THE NORTH PLATTE RIVER, SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY, AND THE SURROUNDING AREA.
(EPA-907/9-79-001)
COMMENTS MADE BY: HEW DOI
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 901361)

EPA, REGION 8

FINAL		DATE
JACKSON WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM		02/12

WYOMING
COUNTY: TETON
PROPOSED IS A WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM FOR THE TOWN OF JACKSON, TETON COUNTY, WYOMING. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE ALTERNATE INTERCEPTOR RIGHT-OF-WAYS, ALTERNATE PLANT SITE LOCATIONS, AND ALTERNATE TREATMENT TECHNIQUES WHICH INCLUDE LAGOONS AND AN OXIDATION DITCH FOLLOWED BY EITHER RAPID INFILTRATION BASINS OR DISCHARGE TO THE SNAKE RIVER OR FLAT CREEK. THE PROPOSED ACTION INVOLVES THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN AERATED LAGOON TREATMENT SYSTEM WITH RAPID INFILTRATION ON APPROXIMATELY 50 ACRES OF THE LOWER BENCH SITE.
(EPA-908/5-79-001B)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE FEA HEW HUD DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 901681)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

CONTACT: MR. UPTON GUTHERY
COORDINATOR
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554
(202) 632-6393

DRAFT DATE

TUCSON FM BROADCASTING CORPORATION, PERMIT 02/23

ARIZONA
COUNTY: PIMA
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW COMMERCIAL FM BROADCAST STATION ON CHANNEL 208 IN TUCSON, PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA. THE APPLICANT PROPOSES TO LOCATE ITS TRANSMITTER AND ANTENNA ON THE SECOND HIGHEST PEAK OF THE TUCSON MOUNTAINS. THE FACILITY WILL OCCUPY ABOUT 6.5 ACRES OF LAND. CONSTRUCTION WILL INCLUDE: THREE TRANSMITTER BUILDINGS, AND ULTIMATELY SIX TOWERS. A 1.8 MILE ACCESS ROAD WILL ALSO BE CONSTRUCTED.
(EIS ORDER # 90202)

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CONTACT: DR. JACK M. HEINEMANN
ADVISOR ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
825 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NE (S-22)
WASHINGTON, DC 20426
(202) 275-4150

FINAL DATE

GREEN LAKE PROJECT NO. 2818, SITKA 02/06

ALASKA
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A LICENSE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE GREEN LAKE PROJECT NO. 2818 BY THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF SITKA, ALASKA. THE ISSUANCE OF A LICENSE WOULD AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION OF: 1) A DAM AT THE OUTLET OF GREEN LAKE, 2) A POWER TUNNEL LEADING TO A POWERHOUSE AT TIDEWATER ON SILVER BAY, 3) A SWITCH-YARD, 4) ACCESS ROADS, 5) A TRANSMISSION LINE AND 6) APPURTENANT FACILITIES. THIS LICENSE WOULD ALSO AUTHORIZE THE OPERATION OF PROJECT WORKS TO PRODUCE AN ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY. THE PROJECT AREA IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY TEN AIR MILES SOUTHEAST OF SITKA CITY PROPER ON THE VODOPAD RIVER.
(FERC-EIS-0006)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA USDA HEW COE
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90145)

DEPARTMENT OF HUD

CONTACT: MR. RICHARD H. BROUN
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
451 7TH STREET, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6306

DRAFT DATE

THE MESA, HAMPTON HILLS AT AURORA 02/15

COLORADO
COUNTY: ARAPAHOE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE HAMPDEN HILLS AT AURORA, A PART OF THE MESA MASTER PLAN, IN ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL CONSIST OF 600 SINGLE FAMILY HOUSES AND LOTS, 366 CLUSTER HOUSES AND 1,201 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS.
(HUD-R.O. 8-EIS-79-XI-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90174)

STONEBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY, MEMPHIS 02/23

TENNESSEE
COUNTY: SHELBY
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE STONEBRIDGE RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY LOCATED NEAR MEMPHIS, SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE. THE SUBDIVISION WILL BE LOCATED ON 602.2 ACRES OF LAND AND WILL INCLUDE SINGLE AND MULTI-FAMILY UNITS, ALONG WITH COMMERCIAL LAND USES. THE PROJECT, WHEN COMPLETED, WILL CONSIST OF APPROXIMATELY 3,753 DWELLING UNITS.
(EIS ORDER # 90200)

CYPRESS MEADOWS SUBDIVISION, MORTGAGE INSURANCE 02/05

TEXAS
COUNTY: HARRIS
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE CYPRESS MEADOWS SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS. THE SUBDIVISION, WHEN COMPLETED WILL ENCOMPASS APPROXIMATELY 312 ACRES AND IS EXPECTED TO CONSIST OF APPROXIMATELY 1,120 DWELLING UNITS. THE DWELLING UNITS WILL BE SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES. SHOPPING AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ARE INCLUDED.
(HUD-R06-EIS-30)
(EIS ORDER # 90138)

DRAFT

PLANKINTON HOUSE AND NORTH WING ADDITION 02/20

WISCONSIN
COUNTY: MILWAUKEE
PROPOSED IS THE CLEARANCE OF ALL IMPROVEMENTS ON URBAN RENEWAL PARCEL S-1 INCLUDING THE DEMOLITION OF THE PLANKINTON HOUSE AND NORTH WING ADDITION (THE LAST REMAINING ACTIVITY) LOCATED IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WISCONSIN. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) NO FEDERAL ACTION, 2) PROJECT AS PROPOSED, AND 3) WITH MODIFICATION. ALTERNATIVE 3 INCLUDES: 1) DOCUMENTATION OF PLANKINTON HOUSE PRIOR THE DEMOLITION, OR 2) REMOVAL AND TRANSFER OF PORTIONS OF THE HOUSE, OR 3) DEMOLITION OF THE NORTH WING ONLY.
(HUD-RUS-EIS-79-04(D))
(EIS ORDER # 902O5)

FINAL
WOODLAND HILLS DEVELOPMENT, WOODBURY 02/13

MINNESOTA
COUNTY: WASHINGTON
THE PROPOSED ACTION CONCERNS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR WOODLAND HILLS, CITY OF WOODBURY, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA. THE DEVELOPMENT COVERS 0.31 SQ. MILES FOR WHICH APPROXIMATELY 656 HOUSING UNITS ARE PLANNED. THESE UNITS WILL BE DESIGNED AS SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED, DUPLEX, TOWNHOUSES, CONDOMINIUM DWELLINGS, IN ADDITION TO A HEALTH CARE FACILITY. FIVE ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED WHICH INCLUDE: 1) DELAYED STAGING OF DEVELOPMENT, 2) LOW OR MODERATE INCOME HOUSING, 3) CHANGE IN DENSITY, 4) OTHER LAND USES, AND 5) NO ACTION.
(HUD-RUS-EIS-78-03-(F))
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI
LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90172)

NORTHWOOD HILLS SUBDIVISION 02/27

TENNESSEE
COUNTY: SHELBY
PROPOSED IS THE NORTHWOOD HILLS 736 UNIT SUBDIVISION. THESE UNITS WILL BE MOSTLY SINGLE-FAMILY WITH SOME TOWNHOUSE UNITS. IT IS LOCATED IN NORTHEAST SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE. IT IS LOCATED IN A RAPIDLY GROWING SECTOR OF SHELBY COUNTY, BOUNDED ON THE SOUTH BY EGYPT CENTRAL ROAD, ON THE WEST BY WEST COLEMAN ROAD, ON THE NORTH BY BOLEN HOUSE ROAD, AND ON THE EAST BY EAST COLEMAN ROAD. THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROXIMATELY 228.4 ACRES OF UNDEVELOPED LAND TO A LARGE PLANNED RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY OFFERING ONLY ONE HOUSING TYPE, THE SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOME.
(HUD-R04-EIS-77-29F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOC DOI USDA EPA TVA FERC DOE GSA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90209)

LASALLE CROSSING SUBDIVISION 02/15

TEXAS
COUNTY: MONTGOMERY
THE PROPOSED ACTION CONCERNS APPROVAL OF HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE PROPOSED LASALLE CROSSING SUBDIVISION LOCATED PARTLY WITHIN THE EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE CITY OF CONROE, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, TEXAS. THE PROJECT INVOLVES THE DEVELOPMENT OF 769 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS WITH AN EXTENSIVE RECREATIONAL AMENITY SITE WHICH INCORPORATES TWO EXISTING MAN-MADE LAKES. THE REMAINDER OF THE 212 ACRE SITE WILL INCORPORATE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY, A WATER WELL SITE AND A SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY.
(HUD-R06-EIS-240)

COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA COE USDA AHP DOI DOI HEW
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 90176)

NORTHWEST EL PASO JOINT VENTURE, EL PASO 02/21

TEXAS
COUNTY: EL PASO
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HUD HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE NORTHWEST EL PASO JOINT VENTURE, EL PASO COUNTY, TEXAS. SEVEN DIFFERENT, ADJOINING OWNERS OF LAND, PLAN TO DEVELOP APPROXIMATELY 2,106.6 ACRES AS RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISIONS. INCLUDED IN THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ARE NEEDED AND NECESSARY SUPPORT FACILITIES, SUCH AS, COMMERCIAL, RECREATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL, FIRE AND UTILITIES. THREE ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
(HUD-R06-EIS-79AF)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI AHP EPA VA
STATE AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90191)

THREE LAKES SUBDIVISION. 02/23

TEXAS
COUNTY: HARRIS
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR THE THREE LAKES SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PROJECT PROVIDES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF APPROXIMATELY 1,665 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AND ENCOMPASSES APPROXIMATELY 370 ACRES. THIS PROPOSAL WAS SUBMITTED BY HOMECRAFT LAND DEVELOPMENT INCORPORATED ON BEHALF OF HOME LAND INCORPORATED.
(HUD-R06-EIS-79-7F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOT EPA COE USDA DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES.
(EIS ORDER # 90197)

ALDERBROOK ESTATES, MASTER PLAN 02/05

WASHINGTON
COUNTY: KING
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR ALDERBROOK ESTATES IN KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON. THE SUBDIVISION, WHICH ENCOMPASSES APPROXIMATELY 171.75 ACRES, WILL INCLUDE APPROXIMATELY: 1) 541 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS, 2) 170 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS, AND 3) 87,000 SQUARE FEET OF BUSINESS SPACE. THE THREE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED ARE: 1) DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OR CANCELLATION BY THE APPLICANT, 2) DISAPPROVAL OF ONE OR BOTH REZONE APPLICATIONS, 3) REJECTION OF PARTICIPATION BY HUD.
(HUD-R10-EIS-78-4F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE EPA DOE DOI AHP
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90139)

SECTION 104(H)

DRAFT DATE

NORTH-CENTRAL JEFFERSON COUNTY WATER SYSTEM 02/05

ALABAMA
COUNTY: JEFFERSON
PROPOSED IS THE EXTENSION OF A POTABLE WATER SUPPLY WITH ADEQUATE PRESSURE TO RESIDENTS FOUND WITHIN THE NORTH-CENTRAL JEFFERSON COUNTY AREA, ALABAMA. THE PROJECT WILL INVOLVE THE INSTALLATION OF APPROXIMATELY 270,000 LINEAR FEET OF PIPE SIZED TO PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY TO ALLEVIATE A DOCUMENTED HEALTH HAZARD. CONSIDERED ARE OPERATIONAL, DESIGN, AND SERVICE AREA ALTERNATIVES.
(EIS ORDER # 90142)

DRAFT

MARINA/COLUMBIA RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 02/01

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: SAN DIEGO
PROPOSED IS THE MARINA/COLUMBIA RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CORE OF DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE PROJECT IS CURRENTLY BEING PLANNED AS A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY, CONTAINING BETWEEN 2,000 AND 3,000 MULTI-LEVEL, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING UNITS. NEIGHBORHOOD CONVENIENCE AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE DEVELOPMENT.
(EIS ORDER # 90128)

FINAL DATE

CHELSEA WATERFRONT NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION 02/28

MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY: SUFFOLK
PROPOSED IS THE REDEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CHELSEA NAVAL HOSPITAL SITE LOCATED IN THE CITY OF CHELSEA, SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS. THE PROGRAM INCLUDES: 1) A WATERSIDE PUBLIC PARK OF 26 ACRES; 2) CONSTRUCTION OF 1200 RESIDENTIAL UNITS INCLUDING 200 DUPLEX TOWNHOUSES, 670 MIDRISE APARTMENTS, 300 SUBSIDIZED ELDERLY APARTMENTS, AND PARKING FOR 700 CARS; 3) A MARINA FOR 250 BOATS AND A 350 SEAT RESTAURANT; AND 4) 200,000 SQUARE FEET OF INDUSTRIAL USE.

COMMENTS MADE BY: HUD EPA FAA COE DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90217)

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

CONTACT: MR. BRUCE BLANCHARD
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
ROOM 4256 INTERIOR BLDG.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240
(202) 343-3891

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

DRAFT DATE

EMERY UNITS 3 AND 4, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION 02/21

UTAH
COUNTY: EMERY
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF TWO ADDITIONAL 430 MEGAWATT COAL-FIRED STEAM-ELECTRIC GENERATING UNITS IN EMERY COUNTY, UTAH. ONE 345KV TRANSMISSION LINE, 116 MILES LONG, WHICH PARALLELS THE EXISTING LINE FOR EMERY UNIT 1, WOULD DELIVER POWER TO A SUBSTATION NEAR LAMP WILLIAMS, UTAH. COAL WOULD BE MINED UNDERGROUND FROM THE PROPOSED COTTONWOOD PORTAL OF THE EXISTING WILBERG MINE AND THE DESERET-BEEHIVE MINES, THEN CONVEYED AND TRUCKED TO THE PLANT. WATER WOULD BE PROVIDED FROM COTTONWOOD AND FERRON CREEK DRAINAGES.
(DES-79-8)
(EIS ORDER # 901491)

CARBON BASIN AREA, COAL LEASING APPLICATION 02/21

WYOMING
COUNTY: CARBON
PROPOSED IS THE LEASING OF FEDERAL COAL, THE GRANTING OF ASSOCIATED RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND SPECIAL LAND-USE PERMITS, FOR AN AREA OF APPROXIMATELY 15,494 ACRES IN THE CARBON BASIN AREA, CARBON COUNTY, WYOMING. THE LEASE WILL BE OBTAINED THROUGH COMPETITIVE BIDDING. THE SPECIAL LAND-USE PERMITS INVOLVE: 1) ONE RAILROAD SPUR, 2) ONE TELEPHONE LINE, 3) ONE ACCESS ROAD, AND 4) THE RELOCATION OF A COUNTY ROAD.
(EIS ORDER # 902081)

FINAL DATE

OCS LEASE SALE 58, WESTERN AND CENTRAL GULF 02/23

GULF OF MEXICO
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE LEASING OF 110 TRACTS (532,885 ACRES) OF OCS LANDS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO OFFSHORE TEXAS, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI AND ALABAMA FOR THE EXPLORATION AND PRODUCTION OF OIL AND GAS. THE TRACTS HAVE WATER DEPTHS RANGING FROM 4M TO 801M AND ARE A DISTANCE OF 5KM TO 206KM FROM THE SHORE. FOUR ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED WHICH INCLUDE: 1) HOLDING THE SALE IN A MODIFIED FORM, 2) WITH-

DRAWING THE SALE, AND 3) DELAYING THE SALE.
(FES-79-8)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT EPA DOC DOE HEW NRC USAF COE USN
MMC
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90201)

FINAL

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT, HERBICIDES, OREGON FORESTS 02/06

OREGON
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THE PROPOSED ACTION IS THE USE OF HERBICIDES REGISTERED WITH EPA TO MANAGE VEGETATION ON APPROXIMATELY 74,500 ACRES ANNUALLY IN COOS, CURRY, DOUGLAS, JACKSON, JOSEPHINE, LANE AND KLAMATH COUNTIES, OREGON. PRIMARY USES INCLUDE: 1) THE PREPARATION OF FOREST LANDS FOR TREE PLANTING, 2) RELEASE OF PLANTED TREES FROM COMPETING VEGETATION, 3) MAINTENANCE OF ROADS, UTILITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS AND CONTROL OF POISONOUS AND NOXIOUS WEEDS. METHODS OF APPLICATION INCLUDE AERIAL, TRUCK MOUNTED EQUIPMENT, HAND HELD DEVICES AND DIRECT HAND APPLICATION.
(FES-78-6)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA AHP EPA DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 901441)

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

FINAL DATE

PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT 02/26

NEW MEXICO TEXAS
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS THE CONTINUATION OF A PHREATOPHYTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CONSISTING OF THE SELECTIVE CLEARING OF SALTCEDAR FROM THE FLOOD PLAIN OF THE PECOS RIVER, FROM SANTA ROSA, NEW MEXICO TO GIRVIN, TEXAS. THE 47,200 ACRE AREA OF CLEARING EXTENDS THROUGH GUADALUPE, DEBACA, CHAVES, AND EDDY COUNTIES IN NEW MEXICO AND THROUGH LORING, REEVES, WARD, CRANE, AND PECOS COUNTIES IN TEXAS.
(FES-79-9)

COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP DOI DOT EPA FERC USDA COE
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(FIS ORDER # 90203)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

FINAL — DATE

SPRING CREEK MINE, MINING/RECLAMATION, PERMIT — 02/24

MONTANA
COUNTY: BIG HORN
PROPOSED IS A SURFACE MINING AND RECLAMATION PLAN FOR THE SPRING CREEK MINE, BIG HORN COUNTY, MONTANA, SUBMITTED BY THE SPRING CREEK COAL COMPANY. THE COMPANY PROPOSES TO OPEN A [illegible] STRIP MINE, CRUSHER AND PLANT, LOADING FACILITIES, HAUL AND ACCESS ROADS, AND RAILROAD SPUR, EXTENDING NORTHWEST FROM THE DECKER MINE. AN ESTIMATED 243 MILLION TONS OF LOW-SULFUR COAL WOULD BE REMOVED FROM AN AREA OF ABOUT 1,850 ACRES WITHIN THE 4,420-ACRE PERMIT AREA.
(FES-79-17)
COMMENTS MADE BY: ARP FERC USDA HEW COE HUD ODI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90214)

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

DRAFT — DATE

BADLANDS NATIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN — 02/01

SOUTH DAKOTA
COUNTY: PENNINGTON JACKSON SHANNON
PROPOSED IS A CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, INTERPRETATION, AND MANAGEMENT OF THE BADLANDS NATIONAL PARK (FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE BADLANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT), LOCATED IN THE COUNTIES OF PENNINGTON, JACKSON, AND SHANNON SOUTH DAKOTA. THE PLAN INCLUDES DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM OF ROADS AND MOTOR NATURE TRAILS, CONSTRUCTION OF CAMPGROUNDS, PICNIC AREAS, CONCESSION FACILITIES, INTERPRETIVE CENTERS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES.
(DES-79-7)
(EIS ORDER # 90125)

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

CONTACT: MS. PATRICIA CRAWFORD
CHIEF, OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
NATIONAL CAPITOL PLANNING COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20576
(202) 724-0200

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT	DATE
WASHINGTON D.C. CIVIC CENTER, SITE LOCATION	02/02

DISTRICT OF CO
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL EIS FILED IN NOVEMBER 1977. PROPOSED ARE SITE LOCATIONS AND THE PROGRAM FOR THE WASHINGTON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIVIC CENTER AND THE TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER RESERVATION 174 FROM THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. THE BASIC PURPOSE OF THE CIVIC CENTER WILL BE TO PROVIDE A LARGE MEETING AND EXHIBITION FACILITY. AMENDMENTS TO THE FINAL EIS INCLUDE: 1) AIR QUALITY, 2) NATURAL FEATURES, 3) TRANSPORTATION, 4) ENERGY/RESOURCE CONSERVATION, 5) THE PHYSICAL/ECONOMIC CHARACTER, AND 6) SOCIAL/DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTER.
(EIS ORDER # 90131)

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CONTACT: MR. VOSS A. MOORE
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS
P-518
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555
(301) 492-8446

DRAFT — DATE

SHOOTERING CANYON URANIUM PROJECT, OPERATION — 02/09

UTAH
COUNTY: GARFIELD
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE SHOOTERING CANYON URANIUM PROCESSING MILL LOCATED IN GARFIELD COUNTY, UTAH. THE MILL WILL HAVE A NOMINAL PROCESSING CAPACITY OF 680 MT OF DRY ORE PER DAY. WASTE MATERIALS FROM THE MILL WILL BE PRODUCED AT A RATE OF ABOUT 680 MT OF SOLIDS PER DAY AND STORED IN A TAILING IMPOUNDMENT. THE STORAGE CAPACITY IS DESIGNED FOR A 20 YEAR PERIOD IN CASE ADDITIONAL ORE IS LOCATED.
(NUREG-0504)
(EIS ORDER # 90156)

FINAL — DATE

GREENE COUNTY NUCLEAR POWERPLANT — 02/21

NEW YORK
COUNTY: GREENE
PROPOSED IS THE ISSUANCE OF A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT TO THE POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE GREENE COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT. THE PLANT WILL EMPLOY A PRESSURIZED-WATER REACTOR TO PRODUCE A WARRANTED OUTPUT OF 3600 MWT. A STEAM TURBINE GENERATOR WILL USE THIS HEAT TO PROVIDE 1191 MWE (NET) OF ELECTRICAL POWER CAPACITY. THE EXHAUST STEAM WILL BE COOLED BY A CLOSED-CYCLE SYSTEM INCORPORATING NATURAL-DRAFT COOLING TOWERS USING MAKEUP WATER FROM THE HUDSON RIVER.
(NUREG-0512)
COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE DOC HEW HUD DOI DOT DOE EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS
(EIS ORDER # 90187)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT — DATE

PILGRIM NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2, ALTERNATIVE SITES — 02/16

MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY: PLYMOUTH
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL EIS FILED IN SEPTEMBER 1974. THE PURPOSE OF THIS SUPPLEMENT IS TO COMPLY WITH THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING APPEAL BOARD WHICH CONCLUDED THAT THE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE SITES FOR THE GENERATING

STATION WAS INADEQUATE UNDER NEPA. THE PROPOSED ACTION IS THE ISSUANCE OF A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT TO BOSTON EDISON COMPANY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 2, LOCATED IN PLYMOUTH, MASSACHUSETTS.
(NUREG-0530)
(EIS ORDER # 901840)

STATE DEPARTMENT

CONTACT: MR. WILLIAM H. MANSFIELD, III
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-2418

FINAL DATE

INCINERATION OF WASTES AT SEA, OCEAN DUMPING 02/14

REGULATORY
PROPOSED IS THE PARTICIPATION OF THE US IN NEGOTIATIONS TO AMEND THE CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION OF MARINE POLLUTION OF DUMPING OF WASTES AND OTHER MATTER, TO ESTABLISH INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE INCINERATION OF WASTES AT SEA TO BE ENFORCED NATIONALLY. THE PURPOSE OF THE REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES IS TO SET STANDARDS TO MINIMIZE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE OCEANS AND THE ATMOSPHERE FROM INCINERATION AT SEA. FIVE ALTERNATIVES ARE CONSIDERED.
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOE HEW DOI DOT
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 90173)

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

CONTACT: DR. HARRY G. MOORE, JR.
ACTING DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
268 401 BUILDING
CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE 37401
(615) 755-3161 FTS 854-3161

FINAL DATE

CORDOVA-UNION-BROWNS FERRY, TRANSMISSION LINE 02/09

TENNESSEE ALABAMA MISSISSIPPI
THE PROPOSED ACTION INVOLVES THE PLAN TO SUPPLY THE ANTICIPATED GENERATION NEEDS FOR THE OVERALL POWER SYSTEM. IN EXAMINING THE ADEQUACY OF THE TRANSMISSION SYSTEM WITH THESE PLANNED GENERATING PLANT ADDITIONS, SOME DEFICIENCIES IN LOCALIZED WESTERN AREAS OF THE POWER SYSTEM BECAME APPARENT. TO SUPPLY THE FORECASTED LOADS FOR THE EARLY 1980'S IN THE MEMPHIS AND JACKSON, TENNESSEE AND TUPELO, MISSISSIPPI AREAS, IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO AUGMENT THE TRANSMISSION CAPACITY TO THESE LOAD CENTERS WITH ADDITIONAL EAST-WEST POWER TRANSFER CAPACITY FACILITIES. THIS PLAN INCLUDES LOCATION, CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE UNION, MISSISSIPPI 500-KV SUBSTATION/200 MILES OF TRANSMISSION LINE.
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA DOI AHP USCG USDA DOE
STATE AGENCIES
(FIS ORDER # 90154)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CONTACT: MR. MARTIN CONVISSER, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
400 7TH STREET, S.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4357

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT DATE

PALMDALE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, PALMDALE 02/09

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: LOS ANGELES
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PALMDALE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LOCATED IN PALMDALE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE PROJECT WILL CONSIST OF: 1) LAND ACQUISITION; 2) SITE PREPARATION; 3) CONSTRUCTION OF A COMMUTER GENERAL AVIATION RUNWAY COMPLEX, INCLUDING SERVICE FACILITIES; AND 4) CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL PARALLEL RUNWAYS. THE PURPOSE OF THIS AIRPORT IS TO PROVIDE INTERNATIONAL AND ALL STAGE-LENGTH HAUL SERVICES THAT WILL ACCOMODATE PART OF THE FUTURE AIR TRANSPORTATION TRAVEL DEMAND OF THE NORTHERN SECTORS OF THE GREATER LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA.
(EIS ORDER # 901491)

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

DRAFT DATE

US 71, MILFORD TO SPIRIT LAKE, CONSTRUCTION 02/06

IOWA
COUNTY: DICKINSON
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION/DEVELOPMENT OF A FOUR-LANE HIGHWAY FACILITY REPLACING AN EXISTING TWO-LANE ROADWAY IN DICKINSON COUNTY, IOWA. THE PROJECT, WHICH WOULD FOLLOW THE GENERAL ALIGNMENT OF EXISTING US 71, WOULD BEGIN JUST SOUTH OF FOURTEENTH STREET IN MILFORD AND EXTEND NORTHERLY TO THE WEST JUNCTION OF IOWA 9, IN SPIRIT LAKE. TOTAL LENGTH OF THE PROJECT IS APPROXIMATELY 7.1 MILES.
(FHWA-IOWA-EIS-79-01-D)
(EIS ORDER # 901471)

THIRD STREET CORRIDOR, IN-37 TO IN-45/46 BYPASS 02/16

INDIANA
COUNTY: MONROE
PROPOSED IS THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THIRD STREET BETWEEN THE IN-37 BYPASS AND THE IN-45/46 BYPASS IN BLOOMINGTON, MONROE COUNTY, INDIANA. THE FACILITY WOULD BE FOUR LANES WITH A FOUR FOOT RAISED MEDIAN AND AN ADDITIONAL LANE FOR TURNS AT

MAJOR INTERSECTIONS. ADDITIONAL SIGNALIZATION WILL BE INSTALLED. ALSO INCLUDED IS AN UNDERPASS AT THE LOUISVILLE/ NASHVILLE RAILROAD.
(FHWA-IND-EIS-78-03-D)
(EIS ORDER # 901791

DRAFT

US 23, LOUISA BY-PASS, RELOCATION 02/23

KENTUCKY
COUNTY: LAWRENCE
PROPOSED IS THE RELOCATION OF FIVE MILES OF US 23 FROM ISAAC'S BRANCH ROAD SOUTH OF LOUISA TO KY-3 NORTH OF LOUISA, LAWRENCE COUNTY, KENTUCKY. THE FACILITY WILL BE A FOUR-LANE, PARTIALLY CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY. IN ADDITION TO NO-BUILD, THREE ALTERNATIVES WITHIN THREE SEPARATE CORRIDORS ARE CONSIDERED.
(FHWA-KY-EIS-78-03-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90196)

US 19, ANDREWS BYPASS TO US 19/NC-28 INTERSECTION 02/05

NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN IMPROVED US 19 FROM THE ANDREWS BYPASS TO THE US 19/NC-28 INTERSECTION NEAR ALMOND IN THE COUNTIES OF CHEROKEE, GRAHAM, MACON AND SWAIN, NORTH CAROLINA. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) CONSTRUCTION OF A FOUR-LANE DIVIDED HIGHWAY ALONG ONE OF EIGHT ALTERNATE LOCATIONS, AND 2) TWO REDUCED FACILITY CONCEPTS.
(FHWA-NC-EIS-78-09-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90140)

I-85, CHARLOTTE BYPASS, NC-273 TO US 29/NC-49 02/26

NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: GASTON MECKLENBURG
PROPOSED IS THE UPGRADING OF APPROXIMATELY 15.6 MILES OF EXISTING I-85 THROUGH CHARLOTTE FROM NC-273 IN GASTON COUNTY TO THE US 29/NC-49 CONNECTOR IN MECKLENBURG COUNTY, ALL WITHIN NORTH CAROLINA. THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS CONSIST OF WIDENING THE EXISTING ROADWAY FROM FOUR TO SIX LANES AND RECONSTRUCTING ALL DEFICIENT INTERCHANGES AND STRUCTURES. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) MASS TRANSIT, 2) A REDUCED FACILITY CONCEPT, 3) THE MAJOR DESIGN ALTERNATIVE, AND 4) DO-NOTHING.
(FHWA-NC-EIS-78-03-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90204)

THE CORVALLIS BYPASS, CORVALLIS 02/06

OREGON
COUNTY: BENTON
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BYPASS AROUND THE CORVALLIS CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT IN BENTON COUNTY, OREGON.

THE BYPASS WOULD RE-ROUTE THROUGH-TRAFFIC, PARTICULARLY HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC AROUND THE CITY. THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDE: 1) DO-NOTHING, 2) A CENTRAL CORRIDOR, 3) A WESTERN CORRIDOR, AND 4) STREET MODIFICATIONS.
(FHWA-DR-EIS-78-06-D)
(EIS ORDER # 901461)

DRAFT

TN-33, BYPASS OF MARYVILLE, TN-115/TN-95 TO TN-73 02/02

TENNESSEE
COUNTY: BLOUNT
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A FOUR-LANE DIVIDED HIGHWAY WHICH WOULD SERVE AS THE SOUTHERN SECTION OF A BYPASS FOR THE CITIES OF MARYVILLE AND ALCOA, TO BE KNOWN AS THE BYPASS OF MARYVILLE, IN BLOUNT COUNTY, TENNESSEE. THE LENGTHS FOR THE VARIOUS ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED RANGE FROM APPROXIMATELY 5.7 MILES TO APPROXIMATELY 11.4 MILES. THE BYPASS WILL BEGIN NEAR THE INTERSECTION OF TN-115 AND TN-95 ON THE WEST SIDE OF MARYVILLE TO TN-73 EAST OF THE CITY.
(FHWA-TN-EIS-78-07-D)
(EIS ORDER # 90157)

FINAL DATE

DEATH VALLEY ROAD, CA-168 TO D. VALLEY NAT'L MON. 02/26

CALIFORNIA
COUNTY: INYO
PROPOSED IS THE IMPROVEMENT OF DEATH VALLEY ROAD, RS-6658, WHICH EXTENDS ABOUT 62.4 MILES FROM CA-168 NEAR BIG PINE TO THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL MONUMENT NEAR UBEHEBE CRATER IN INYO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. PLANS CALL FOR THE PAVEMENT OF PORTIONS WHICH ARE NOW GRAVEL, REALIGNMENT OF ISOLATED SECTIONS, AND UPGRADING OF THE ROADWAY TO INCREASE SAFETY. THE PROJECT WILL DISPLACE 40 ACRES OF VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE, AND WILL INCREASE NOISE, LITTER AND SECONDARY AIR POLLUTION.
(FHWA-CA-EIS-77-03-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT COE USDA DOI
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 81243)

FAP 408, HARRY TO QUINCY 02/09

ILLINOIS
COUNTY: PIKE ADAMS
THE STATEMENT REFERS TO THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A SECTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FREEWAY F.A.P. 408 BETWEEN HARRY AND QUINCY. IT WILL PROVIDE A 4-LANE, FULLY ACCESS CONTROLLED FACILITY IN PIKE AND ADAMS COUNTIES FOR A LENGTH OF 26 MILES.
(FHWA-ILL-EIS-74-01-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOT DOI USDA COE EPA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90151)

FINAL

I-380, WATERLOO TO CEDAR FALLS 02/12

IOWA
COUNTY: BLACK HAWK
THE PROPOSED ACTION IS THE EXTENSION OF I-380 IN BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IOWA. THE FACILITY WOULD BEGIN AT THE JUNCTION OF PROPOSED FREEWAY 520 AND U.S. HIGHWAY 218 IN THE SOUTHEAST PORTION OF WATERLOO, AND PROCEED NORTHWESTERLY APPROXIMATELY 8.9 MILES TO THE JUNCTION OF U.S. HIGHWAY 20 AND PROPOSED FREEWAY 518 IN THE VICINITY OF THE WATERLOO METROPOLITAN AIRPORT. ALL OF THE ALTERNATIVES WILL REQUIRE URBAN DEVELOPED AND UNDEVELOPED LAND, AND SOME ALTERNATIVES WILL REQUIRE LAND FROM PUBLICLY OWNED PARKS.
(FHWA-IOWA-EIS-77-03-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: HUD USDA DOI EPA COE DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 901671)

ELKADER BYPASS, IOWA 13 02/27

IOWA
COUNTY: CLAYTON
THE PROPOSED PROJECT INVOLVES THE IMPROVEMENT OF A SEGMENT OF IOWA 13 IN CLAYTON COUNTY IN NORTHEAST IOWA. THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT PROVIDES FOR A TWO-LANE FACILITY FOR A LENGTH OF APPROXIMATELY 2.4 MILES. THIS STATEMENT STUDIES FOUR ALIGNMENTS, INCLUDING THREE RELOCATIONS AND ONE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EXISTING IOWA 13. ALTERNATES ARE: 1) TWO-LANE FACILITY FOLLOWING PRESENT ALIGNMENT, 2) TWO-LANE EASTERN BYPASS, PROCEEDING NORTHEAST, REJOINING EXISTING ALIGNMENT, 3) TWO-LANE PARTIAL BYPASS, PROCEEDING NORTH, REJOINING IOWA 13, AND 4) TWO-LANE BYPASS PARALLELING ALTERNATE 2.
(FHWA-IOWA-EIS-78-02-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: DOI EPA USDA HUD COE DOT
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS
(EIS ORDER # 90210)

MI-29, RECONSTRUCTION, ALGONAC 02/21

MICHIGAN
COUNTY: ST. CLAIR
PROPOSED IS THE RECONSTRUCTION OF 1.5 MILES OF MI-29 FROM THE WEST CITY LIMITS TO CHANNELSIDE DRIVE, CITY OF ALGONAC, ST. CLAIR COUNTY, MICHIGAN. SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN

CONSIDERED WHICH INCLUDE: 1) NO ACTION, 2) MINOR CHANGES ON EXISTING ROADWAY, 3) ALTERNATE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, 4) A COMBINATION OF FOUR AND FIVE LANES, 5) ONE-WAY PAIR LANES, AND 6) FIVE LANES.
(FHWA-MICH-77-04-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: EPA HUD DOI COE USCG USDA
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(FIS ORDER # 90190)

FINAL

FAYETTEVILLE AIRPORT CONNECTOR TO I-95 02/09

NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: CUMBERLAND
THE PROPOSED PROJECT CONSISTS OF PROVIDING ACCESS BETWEEN THE FAYETTEVILLE AIRPORT AND PLANNED I-95 BY: CONSTRUCTING AN INTERCHANGE ON I-95 AT OR NEAR NC-2219; AND PROVIDING A TWO-LANE FACILITY BETWEEN THE NEW INTERCHANGE AND NC-2212. THE PROPOSED INTERCHANGE WILL BE LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1.8 TO 2.2 MILES FROM THE NEAREST PLANNED INTERCHANGE (AT NC-87 RELOCATED). SIX ALTERNATIVES CONSIDER: NO BUILD, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, A NORTHERN INTERCHANGE LOCATION AND PARTIAL RELOCATION AND IMPROVEMENTS. THE PROJECT IS LOCATED IN CUMBERLAND COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.
(FHWA-NC-EIS-78-04-F)
COMMENTS MADE BY: COE HEW DOE GSA EPA DOI
STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90152)

GREENVILLE RAILROAD DEMONSTRATION, US 69 CROSSING 02/13

TEXAS
COUNTY: HUNT
THE PROPOSED ACTION INVOLVES ELIMINATION OF EXISTING RAILROAD/COMMUNITY CONFLICTS IN THE RAILROAD DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN GREENVILLE, TEXAS. PLANS CALL FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE LOUISIANA AND ARKANSAS RAILROAD COMPANY (L&A) AND ST. LOUIS-SOUTHWESTERN RAILWAY LINES (SSW) TO THE PRESENT SSW ALIGNMENT, AND A GRADE SEPARATION FACILITY BETWEEN THE RAILROADS AND U.S. 69.
(FHWA-TX-EIS-77-01-F)

COMMENTS MADE BY: USDA COE EPA DOI
STATE AGENCIES
GROUPS, INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES
(EIS ORDER # 90170)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT DATE

PRIMARY HIGHWAY EXTENSION, I-95 TO WILMINGTON 02/28

NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY: SEVERAL
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A DRAFT EIS FILED IN NOVEMBER 1977 CONCERNING THE EXTENSION OF I-40 FROM RALEIGH TO WIL-

MINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA. THIS STATEMENT IS CONCERNED WITH THE PORTION OF THE PROJECT BETWEEN THE PROPOSED TERMINUS OF I-40 AT I-95 NEAR BENSON TO WILMINGTON. THE FOUR-LANE FACILITY WOULD EXTEND FOR A DISTANCE OF 91.5 MILES, WITH FULL ACCESS CONTROL. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDE: 1) NO BUILD WITH IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING FACILITIES, 2) AN EXPRESSWAY, AND 3) EIGHT FREEWAY CONSTRUCTION LOCATION ALTERNATIVES. THE PROJECT WILL PASS THROUGH THE COUNTIES OF JOHNSTON, SAMPSON, DUPLIN, PENDER AND NEW HANOVER.
(FHWA-NC-EIS-77-07-DS)
(EIS ORDER # 90214)

U.S.COAST GUARD

DRAFT	DATE
TANKER SAFETY AND POLLUTION PREVENTION	02/09

REGULATORY
PROPOSED ARE AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN POLLUTION PREVENTION REGULATIONS CONCERNING TANKER SAFETY AND POLLUTION PREVENTION. THESE AMENDMENTS WOULD IMPLEMENT SHIP/TANKER CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TANKER SAFETY AND POLLUTION PREVENTION, AND THE PORT AND TANKER SAFETY ACT. THESE AMENDMENTS WILL APPLY TO BOTH NEW AND EXISTING CRUDE AND PRODUCT CARRIERS.
(EIS ORDER # 90155)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENT	DATE
SEADOCK APPLICATION AMENDMENT, TOPA, LICENSE	02/23

TEXAS GULF OF MEXICO
THIS STATEMENT SUPPLEMENTS A FINAL EIS FILED IN DECEMBER 1976 CONCERNING THE ISSUANCE OF A LICENSE TO SEADOCK INCORPORATED. THIS DOCUMENT COVERS THE TRANSFER OF THAT LICENSE TO THE TEXAS DEEPWATER PORT AUTHORITY (TOPA). PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A DEEPWATER PORT IN THE GULF OF MEXICO APPROXIMATELY 26 MILES OFF THE COAST OF FREEPORT, TEXAS. ADDRESSED ARE THE CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP, CHANGES IN THE PROJECT DESIGN AND NEW DATA WHICH HAS BECOME AVAILABLE.
(EIS ORDER # 90198)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

CONTACT: MR. WILLARD SITLER
DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS OFFICE (66)
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
810 VERMONT AVENUE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2526

DRAFT — DATE

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL — 02/22

ARKANSAS
COUNTY: PULASKI
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 505 BED MEDICAL CENTER IN LITTLE ROCK, PULASKI COUNTY, ARKANSAS TO REPLACE THE EXISTING ROOSEVELT ROAD HOSPITAL WHICH IS ALSO LOCATED IN LITTLE ROCK. THE REPLACEMENT HOSPITAL WILL OCCUPY A 23.3 ACRE SITE ADJACENT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS APPROXIMATELY 3 MILES NORTHWEST OF THE EXISTING SITE. THREE ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED.
(EIS ORDER # 90193)

VA REPLACEMENT MEDICAL CENTER, BALTIMORE — 02/22

MARYLAND
COUNTY: BALTIMORE
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 400-BED MEDICAL CENTER IN BALTIMORE, MARYLAND TO REPLACE AND UPGRADE EXISTING FACILITIES. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INCLUDED EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, 3 SITES IN DOWNTOWN BALTIMORE, AND NO ACTION. THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IS A SITE IN DOWNTOWN BALTIMORE OPPOSITE THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND HOSPITAL COMPLEX AND WILL INVOLVE THE CLOSING OF THE VA'S FORT HOWARD MEDICAL CENTER.
(EIS ORDER # 90192)

FINAL — DATE

VA MEDICAL CENTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — 02/13

DISTRICT OF CO
PROPOSED IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 120-BED NURSING HOME CARE UNIT (NHCU), CLINICAL FACILITIES, AND AN UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE AT THE WASHINGTON, D.C. VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL. THE NHCU WILL CONSIST OF TWO 60-BED WINGS ON ONE LEVEL, CLINICAL FACILITIES ON ONE LEVEL AND A BASEMENT LEVEL.
COMMENTS MADE BY: AHP EPA VA DOT DOI
LOCAL AGENCIES
(EIS ORDER # 90171)

SUMMARY OF 102 STATEMENTS FILED IN 1979

(By Agency) -75-

Agency	Draft 102's for Actions on which no Final 102's have been rec.	Final 102's on Legislation and Actions	Suppl.	Total Actions on which Draf or Final Stat have been rec.
Agriculture, Department of	17	10	1	28
Appalachian Regional Commission				
Architect of the Capitol				
Canal Zone Government				
Civil Aeronautics Board	0	1	0	1
Commerce, Department of	1	3	3	7
Consumer Product Safety Comm.				
Defense, Department of				
Air Force	2	0	1	3
Army				
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	10	9	1	20
Navy	1	0	0	1
Delaware River Basin Comm.				
Energy, Department of	2	1	1	4
Energy Policy Office				
Energy Research & Devel. Admin.				
Environmental Protection Agency	8	9	0	17
Federal Energy Administration				
Federal Maritime Commission	2	0	0	2
Federal Energy Regulatory Comm.	0	2	0	2
Federal Trade Commission				
General Services Administration	0	1	0	1
Great Lakes Basin Commission				
HEW, Department of				
HUD, Department of	15	16	0	31
Interior, Department of	5	7	1	13
International Boundary and Water Comm. -- U.S. and Mexico				
Interstate Commerce Commission	1	0	0	1
Justice, Department of				
Labor, Department of				
Nat'l. Aeronautics & Space Admin.				
Nat'l. Capitol Planning Comm.	0	0	1	1
Nat'l. Science Foundation				
New England River Basins Comm.				
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	2	2	1	5
Office of Science Technology				
Ohio River Basin Commission				
Pacific Northwest River Basins Comm.				
Pennsylvania Ave. Devel. Corporation				
Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Comm.				
State Department	0	2	0	2
Tennessee Valley Authority	0	1	0	1
Transportation, Department of	24	17	2	43
Treasury, Department of				
Upper Mississippi River Basin Comm.				
U.S. Postal Service				
U.S. Water Resources Council				
Veterans Administration	3	1	0	4
Federal Communications Comm.	1	0	0	1

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

102 MONITOR

The 102 Monitor is a monthly publication of the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition to its listing of Environmental Impact Statements which have been filed under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Monitor contains a list of EPA's comments, filed under the provisions of Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; items of current concern in NEPA case law; information on the environmental studies of the Council on Environmental Quality; and other matters of interest.

The 102 Monitor is printed and distributed by the Government Printing Office. The subscription rate for the Monitor is $20.00 annually, with an additional $5.00 charge for foreign mailing; individual copies of the Monitor are $1.70 domestic and $2.15 foreign and are available from GPO.

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

(Difficulties in obtaining copies of the 102 Monitor should be referred to GPO's Service Section, P.O. Box SSOS, Washington, D.C. 20402.)

Prices revised May, 1978

CHANGE OF ADDRESS FORM

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

Mail this form to: NEW ADDRESS

Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office SSOM
Washington, D.C. 20402

Attach last subscription label here.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO: 102 MONITOR (MNT)

@ $20.00 Domestic; @ $25.00 Foreign

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

(or) COUNTRY

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. .....

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402